AN

INTRODUCTION

TO THE

ART OF READING

WITH

ENERGY AND PROPRIETY.

1872
CITY OF WASHINGTON

BY

JOHN RICE.

LONDON:
Printed for J. and R. TONSON, in the Strand.
MDCCLXV.

PN4105
.R5

a. m. P., Feb. 2, 1915.

TO

WILLIAM KENRICK Esq. *I.U.D.*

IN RETURN

FOR THE OBLIGATIONS,

CONFERED

BY HIS ADVICE AND ASSISTANCE,

IN CONCERTING AND EXECUTING

A PLAN

FOR IMPROVING THE PRACTICE OF READING,

AND ESTABLISHING

A CRITERION FOR THE PRONUNCIATION

OF THE ENGLISH TONGUE;

THIS INTRODUCTION IS GRATEFULLY

INSCRIBED

BY HIS MOST OBEDIENT

AND MOST OBLIGED

HUMBLE SERVANT

JOHN RICE.

CONTENTS.

CHAP. I.

Observations on the Defects and Perfection of Reading *in general.* 1

CHAP. II.

The Analysis of SPEECH.

SECT. I. *Of Speech in general.* 19

SECT. II. *Of the vocal Part of Speech.* ib.

SECT. III. *Of the Modulation of* SPEECH, *and the Distinction between* SPEAKING *and* SINGING. 21

SECT. IV. *Of* ARTICULATION, *or the Times and Powers of distinct Voices.* 31

SECT. V. *Of the Length of Syllables in English.* 36

SECT.

SECT. VI. *Rules for determining the natural Length of articulate Voices or Syllables.* 45

SECT. VII. *Of the Nature and Use of Accent.* 54

SECT. VIII. *Of the Seat of the Accent, and its pretended Use in the Formation of Words.* 76

SECT IX. *Of the Number, Diversity, and proper Use of Accents.* 82

SECT. X. *Of the Power and Use of Accent in the Quantity of Verse.* 99

SECT XI. *Of English Numbers, or metrical Feet.* 114

SECT XII. *On the Mechanism and Harmony of English Verse.* 143

CHAP. III.

Of the sentimental or significant Part of Speech, with the natural and artificial Relations and Connections of Sense and Sound.

SECT. I. *Of the general Resemblance between Sense and Sound, in Speaking or Reading.* 184

SECT.

SECT II. *Of the Difference between ſpoken and written Language, and the true Criterion of ſimple Pronunciation.* 193

SECT. III. *Of the Nature and Uſe of Emphaſis in general.* 196

SECT IV. *Of the Abuſe of Emphaſis.* 202

SECT V. *Of Pauſe, Cadence, Tone and Geſture.* 236

CHAP. IV.

Of the Application of the preceding Rules and Obſervations to the Recital of the different Species of literary Compoſition.

SECT. I. *Of grammatical Conſtruction, and the natural Order of Words.* 254

SECT II. *Of ſimple Narrative, or mere Relation.* 262

SECT. III. Of *Deſcription.* 266

SECT. IV *Of Preaching, Pleading, and other publick Speaking.* 279

SECT.

SECT. V. *Of Theatrical Declamation, or the Art of reciting dramatic Compoſitions.* 290

APPENDIX.

The Sketch of a Plan for eſtabliſhing a Criterion, by which the Pronunciation of Languages may be aſcertained; and, in particular that of the Engliſh Tongue, reduced to a Certain fixt Standard. 307

AN

AN

INTRODUCTION

TO THE

ART OF READING

WITH

ENERGY and PROPRIETY.

CHAP. I.

Observations on the Defects and Perfection of Reading *in general.*

IT is remarkable, that among the numerous Writers on the Arts of *Speaking* and *Writing*, there are few or none who have treated profeſſedly on that of *Reading*.

We have, indeed, many Books which treat curſorily of the *Pronunciation* of *particular Languages:* But the *Pronunciation*,

or Method of *Sounding* the particular *Words* of a Language, is acquired by *Habit*, and not by *Art* *: And it is poſſible (at leaſt we may conceive) that a Man may be able to pronounce every Word of a Language in the moſt unexceptionable Manner, who might, nevertheleſs, be incapable of *Reading* † any Language whatever.

Again, we have Tracts on the Art of *Speaking*; but neither *Reading* nor *Speaking* is confined to *mere Sound*. A Perſon can with no more Propriety be ſaid to *ſpeak* than to *read* a Language he does not *underſtand*. Indeed, the Writers on the Art of *Speaking* are, for the moſt Part, ſo far from confining it to the mere Exerciſe of the Faculty of *Speech*, that they extend it ſo far as to include the Arts of corporeal *Geſture* and intellectual Deſign or *Compo-*

* At leaſt, if there are People ingenious in their Way, who can facilitate the Acquiſition of this Habit, their Art is not yet regularly admitted into the Encyclopedia.

† A Man may poſſibly learn to pronounce Latin, Greek and Hebrew, as was the Caſe with the Daughters of Milton, who are ſaid to have read to him in thoſe Languages when he was blind; but *Reading*, as an *Art*, is not underſtood in that Senſe, in which People may be ſaid to *read* what they do not *comprehend*.

ſition;

ſition; ſo that, according to their Notions, no one can be ſaid to *ſpeak well*, who is not at the ſame Time a good Actor, and a good Writer: And, indeed, it is allowed, theſe two Characters muſt enter into that of a compleat *Orator*.

A *Reader*, however, need neither be a *Writer* nor an *Actor*, much leſs a finiſhed *Orator*. By the Art of Reading, to which this Eſſay is intended as an Introduction, is meant ſimply the Art of *Pronunciation* in *general*, or that of *intelligibly* and emphatically repeating or rehearſing what is *written* in any Language: No Patavinity or Provinciality of Dialect*, which is merely local and tranſitory, interfering with an Art, eſtabliſhed on the fundamental Principles of all Language.

The

* This may, indeed, in ſome Caſes, be ſo great as to render ſuch Lecture almoſt unintelligible; but the diſcerning Reader cannot miſtake the Author's Meaning. He ſuppoſes his Pupil capable of pronouncing every Word in this reſpect unexceptionably; it not being his Deſign to teach People their Alphabet or Spelling Book. It is true, no Perſon can be ſaid to ſpeak *gracefully* or elegantly who retains any Vulgarity or provincial Peculiarity of Pronunciation. This Defect, however, is more juſtly excuſeable, if not more eaſily remedied, than any Deficiency in Emphaſis. The Buſineſs of the preſent Eſſay, is rather to

The Art of Reading, as here defined, may, at firſt View, ſeem very eaſily attainable; on a very little Reflection, however, it will be diſcerned, that the Narrative of the Hiſtorian, the Deſcriptions of the Poet, and the Declamations of the Orator, are not to be intelligibly repeated, without ſome Portion of the Senſe and Spirit of all three.

A mere audible Recital of the Words of any Author, as it may be made by a Perſon who doth not underſtand what he ſays, ſo it may be made alſo in ſuch a Manner as not to be underſtood by thoſe who hear him; or if not *totally* unintelligible, be at leaſt but *imperfectly* or *falſely* underſtood; whereas the Art of READING conſiſts in *conveying* to the *Hearer* the *whole Meaning* of the *Writer*.

To this End, it is evidently neceſſary that the Reader ſhould himſelf underſtand what he reads, before he can poſſibly re-

ſhew the Uſe and Means of Reading intelligibly than Speaking gracefully. Perſons may read with Propriety, who do not ſpeak elegantly; but no Perſon can be Maſter of graceful Lecture, or Repetition, without firſt having acquired the Art of Reading intelligibly and emphatically.

peat

peat it intelligibly to others. This is the firſt and indiſputable Qualification of a Reader; without which, the moſt articulate Pronunciation, with all the Artifices of Tone, Look or Geſture, will avail nothing, or only ſerve to miſlead the Hearer; the Orator, Actor and Reader, being all underſtood to *ſay*, what they appear to *mean*, rather than what they *literally* utter *.

Now, as the mere Reader hath no other Means of conveying the Meaning of the Writer than by vocal Utterance or Pronunciation, ſo theſe Means are the leaſt equivocal of all others, and the ſureſt Criterion of a clear Underſtanding in the one, and Preciſeneſs of Expreſſion in the other: For it is here to be obſerved, that what is *ill written* can never be *well read*; for which Reaſon we ſhould not be too ready to cenſure the indifferent Readers of indifferent Writings.

It is very certain, however, that there are Perſons of moſt excellent Underſtand-

* As a Proof of this, might be quoted a Number of Paſſages, literally harmleſs and inoffenſive; which may nevertheleſs be ſo ſpoken as to inflame the Hearer with the moſt ſudden and impetuous Reſentment.

ings, and who perfectly comprehend what they read, and yet are incapable of audibly conveying to others the Meaning they ſo well comprehend; and this not from any Ignorance of Language, or Defect in their Faculties of Speech; but for Want of having properly cultivated them by an Attention to the Art in Queſtion.

Emphaſis is to the *Reading* a Language, what *Syntaxis* is to the *Writing* it; the preciſe Meaning of what is read or written depending reſpectively on *Pronunciation* and *Conſtruction* *.

Now it is remarkable that all Perſons, the moſt illiterate not excepted, when they ſpeak with Energy in Converſation, generally pronounce, or emphaſize, their

* It is preſumed, from this Analogy between *Reading* and *Writing*, that the Obſervations contained in this Work, may be of ſome Service alſo to Writers, by inducing them to pay Attention to the Manner in which their Works may be recited; a Circumſtance that will neceſſarily improve and meliorate their Stile, whether they compoſe in Proſe or Verſe. It hath been obſerved by ſome Writers on this Subject, that Poets may be able to arrange their Words properly in Metre, according to the Rules of Verſification, even if they were ignorant of the proper Accent and Emphaſis of Words. Such Poetry could not fail, however, of being extremely defective; for the Reaſons hereafter aſſigned.

Diſcourſe with great Propriety †: And yet there are few, who, in reciting what is written, do not greatly differ in their manner of pronouncing the ſame Sentences. Nay, ſome have been known to ſpeak, with great Energy and Propriety, thoſe very Words, which, being taken down, and afterwards ſhewn to them in Writing or Print, they have not been able, without great Difficulty, and after repeated Trials, to pronounce in the preciſe Tone and Manner in which they had uttered them.

It appears, from this Circumſtance, that if the Reader could make the Words and Sentiments of the Writer his own, he would deliver a *written Lecture* with the ſame Propriety as he utters his own Diſcourſe; his Reading having the ſame Preciſion and Energy as his Converſation. Thus a good Actor, who perfectly comprehends his Author, and enters into the Spirit of the Cha-

† This Rule is not, indeed, without ſome Exceptions. Theſe, however, are very few, and conſiſt only of ſuch phraſeological Expreſſions as we make Uſe of, without attending to the particular Energy of all the Words compoſing them; attending only to the general and arbitrary Senſe of the Whole.

racter he aſſumes, will recite exactly as he would converſe. In this Caſe, however, the *Player* really does make the Words and Sentiments of the Writer his own; which it is not the Buſineſs of a *Reader* to do. A Perſon may, by due Attention, become an excellent Reader, and yet have no other Qualification of an Actor whatever; at the ſame Time it is notorious, that ſome tolerable Actors are but very indifferent Readers. The Reaſon of this is, that the Actor enters into the Spirit of his Character, before he hath ſufficiently ſtudied the Meaning of his Author; and thus may perſonate ſuch Character with great Propriety in general, while he perverts the Senſe of particular Paſſages, for Want of a due Attention to the peculiar Conſtruction and Meaning of each Sentence. Were a good Actor alſo a juſt Reader, he would certainly excel all other Readers; as that would be habitual to him, which in others muſt be the Effect of Art; than which nothing is more difficult, and at the ſame Time more neceſſary to conceal.

As the Art of Reading does not conſiſt, like that of Acting, in really adopting the

Words

Words and Sentiments of the Writer; it is ſufficient, that the Reader recite what is written in ſuch a Manner, that the Auditors, at the Time of Hearing, might conceive it then firſt ſpoken by the Perſon reciting; or at leaſt in ſuch a Manner as the Perſon, firſt ſpeaking it, would naturally have uttered it.

Now, this Art hath been hitherto ſo greatly neglected, that few Writers have advanced any Thing ſatisfactory on the Subject; not one having laid down Rules profeſſedly with the View here pointed out. Precepts enough have been given to qualify Players and Orators: But this is beginning at the wrong End, and is almoſt as bad as a Muſician's attempting to teach Perſons to play in Time and Tune, before they can ſound ſimple Notes.

Reading may, with Propriety, be called artificial Speaking; as it is, indeed, the Imitation of natural Eloquence. Hence, like all other imitative Arts, its End is defeated by every Appearance of Study, Habit, or Affectation. Any Peculiarity of Tone and Manner of Reading, therefore, muſt be diſguſtful, as it is unnatural;

ral; in like Manner the ſtudied Artifices of *Declamation* are equally exceptionable, and for the ſame Reaſon.

It is nevertheleſs very certain that, as there are few common Readers, who have not a diſagreeable habitual Tone; ſo there are few pretended Adepts in this Art, who are not mere Declaimers.

It is difficult to ſay which of the two are moſt intolerable: It is plain, however, that as the former muſt get rid of his acquired Habit, ſo the latter muſt unlearn almoſt all he hath learned, before he can poſſibly be a good Reader.

Before any Rules indeed can be laid down for the Study of this Art, it is neceſſary to eradicate thoſe Prejudices which will prevent People from profiting by them.

The great Source of vicious Habits in Reading, is the erroneous Method of teaching Children to *read* before they learn to *write*, or the making them *recite* what they do not *underſtand*. I ſhould be glad to know of what Uſe it is, to teach Children to gabble over a Parcel of Words, the Meaning of which they do not

not comprehend, as is almoſt univerſally the Cuſtom, unleſs it be with a Deſign that the little Prattlers may divert their Parents ſomething more agreeably than mere Perroquets. Of this, at leaſt, I am certain, that it would be of great Utility, in more Ways than one, if Children were not taught to pronounce their Letters, till they were taught to delineate them; and that they ſhould firſt learn to write and read their own Words and Sentiments *, and not recite or copy thoſe of others. There is not a more vicious Cuſtom, in

* Theſe might be objected to, as not always grammatical and juſt.—No Matter: let the ill Conſtruction of their Language, and the Impropriety of their Sentiments, be gradually corrected together: By which Means they may alſo acquire a Stile, or Method of expreſſing themſelves on any Subject with Eaſe, and in *their own Way*. Whereas, at preſent, there are comparatively but few Perſons capable of committing their Sentiments to Paper with Facility and Propriety: Add to this, that they almoſt all write in the ſame Manner; their common Letters on Buſineſs or Pleaſure running all in the ſame Strain; being compoſed of the Phraſes and Turns of Expreſſion, taken from popular Writers, or thoſe generally in Uſe. Nor is this only the Caſe with the Unlearned; our claſſical Scholars having, for the moſt Part, as little Stile of their own, as the Illiterate: Their Verſes being little better than *Centos*, and their proſe Writings a ſtrange Jargon or Mixture of different Idioms and Scholaſtic Phraſeology.

the

the whole Practice of modern Education, than that of ſetting Youth to get Verſes, or Declamations, and to repeat them by Rote. This Cuſtom, I know, is adopted with a View to exerciſe the Memory; but, ſetting aſide the Abſurdity of exerciſing the Memory with the Retention of mere *Sounds*, it is very certain that a vacant Mind will retain *Things* much better than one which is overcharged with ſuperfluous Ideas; and perhaps this Vacuity is one Reaſon why the Memory is better in Youth than in Age. Be this, however, as it will, it is at all Ages much eaſier to learn to remember, than to learn to forget: And yet the latter is full as neceſſary as the former; young Perſons finding themſelves, on entering into Life, more bewildered by the Prejudices of their Education (i. e. what they remember to have been *taught*) than from their real Ignorance of the World, or what they have ſtill to *learn*. And hence it is, that in applying the Acquiſitions made in their Education to any good Purpoſe, they are obliged to throw aſide, and to forget the greater Part of them.

It may ſeem ſtrange, that I ſhould diſſuade Preceptors from teaching Children to read till they teach them to write, and at the ſame Time to write and read their own Expreſſions; the Reaſons for it, however, are very obvious; as, by ſo doing, Children will acquire ſo ſtrong a Senſe of that Analogy which ſubſiſts between Reading and Speaking, that they can never fall into the vicious Habits of reciting otherwiſe than they converſe: In which Caſe, nothing more would be requiſite to enable them to read any Work with Propriety, than the perfect Comprehenſion of the Author's Senſe; which is not, as before obſerved, altogether ſufficient for grown Perſons at preſent.

To eradicate entirely a vicious Habit of Pronunciation muſt be the Work of Time: It is requiſite, however, that ſuch as are deſirous of being cured of it, ſhould look upon it in the Light of a Prejudice, and apply themſelves to the Study of proper Rules, and be conſtant in the Practice of them.

As to the Vices of Declamation, they may alſo be called Habits; but, if more lately

lately acquired, are the more eaſily exterminable. The great Obſtacle to the Removal of theſe, is the ſtrong Perſuaſion of their Propriety: There is a wide Difference, however, between Artifice and Art; between the Knack of exhibiting a falſe Image, and the Power of imitating the real one of Nature. Perſons will not eaſily give up a Defect while they eſteem it a Beauty: Thus it would be no eaſy Matter to perſuade an Actor, that he might play the loweſt Parts in Comedy, and the ſublimeſt of Tragedy, without altering the natural Tone of his Voice. No! in the one he muſt roar like Thunder, and in the other ſqueak like a Puppet.

The Story of the Painter who made his Pictures *fine*, becauſe he could not make them *beautiful*, is well known: There are others, who to repreſent Men *great*, make them *big*: The Tragedian, in like manner, to give himſelf the Dignity of a Hero, whips on high-heel Shoes, ſtruts and talks *loud*.

Next to the intolerable Cacophony of the Whine and Cant of the Illiterate

rate *, the Monotony of the artificial Declaimer is moſt diſguſtful: Not that he may want Variety in the Inflections of his Voice; but theſe are made to ſucceed each other ſo regularly, that whatever he be repeating, it ſeems to be ſtill the Burthen of the ſame Song †.

This Error may be imputed, in a great Degree, to their dealing generally in Poetry and Blank Verſe. It is, nevertheleſs, a very whimſical Reaſon for mouthing out the Writings of an Author, becauſe they conſiſt of Couplets, or are printed in Lines of ten Syllables.

* I uſe the Word *Illiterate* here only for Want of a better; as it is very certain, that there are Gentlemen of profound Learning who make as bad a Figure in this Reſpect, as the moſt illiterate of the whining Miniſters of a Country Conventicle. *Gannimus Docti Indocti*que.

† The Declamations of ſome of our Tragedians, indeed, greatly reſemble the homotonous *ti dum ti* of the Recitative in our modern Operas; the Muſic to which is, for the moſt Part, ſo horribly compoſed, that the Words can hardly ever be underſtood by the Audience. And how ſhould it be otherwiſe, when the Compoſer (whatever may be his Pretenſions to Singing, or Judgment in Muſic) is uſually ſo incapable of *Reading*, and ſo ignorant of *Proſody*, as to make long Syllables ſhort, ſhort ones long, and ſo to miſplace the Accent and Emphaſis of the Whole, as to render it totally unintelligible?

And

And yet there is hardly one Reader in ten Thouſand, who would ſit down to recite a Tragedy, or Epic Poem, with that Eaſe and Placidity of Countenance he would naturally wear, in repeating a Paragraph in a common News-paper. The Lines drawn up in Rank and File, with a capital Initial at the Head of each, look formidable, and ſeem to demand a peculiar Degree of Sound and Energy.

Hence it is that we ſee, on theſe Occaſions, the very Features of the Reader aſſume a new Form; an Air of conſequential Gravity ſettles on his Brow, his Cheeks ſwell, and his Lips, forming the *Os magna Sonaturum*, project with all the ridiculous Importance imaginable.

Will it be objected, that "if Verſe were "to be recited like Proſe, with a ſtrict "Attention to the Senſe of the Author, "and a very ſlight one to the Numbers; "the Harmony of thoſe Numbers would "be loſt?"—— By no Means. Preſerve the Senſe, and depend on it all the *true* Harmony will be preſerved with it.

By *true Harmony*, I mean that only which is conſiſtent with Propriety; the moſt flowing Numbers loſing all their Effect,

fect, if they do not properly accompany the Senſe of the Words *.

In Proſe, the Harmony of the Periods neceſſarily accompanies this Senſe, as it is conſtituted by the natural Succeſſion or Combination of the Accents or Emphaſis of the ſeveral Words compoſing ſuch Periods. In like manner, in reading Poetry, if the Numbers interfere with the Harmony of the Period, there is a Defect in the Compoſition: For though the Harmony of proſaic Periods is different, or will admit of greater Latitude and Variety, than thoſe of Poetry; yet the Laws of Diction require that the Senſe and Meaning of the Writer ſhould be conſiſtent with both †.

On

* Smoothneſs, or an eaſy Flow of Stile, is but one Species of this Harmony, which does not conſiſt in the ſimple Melody of Sound; but in the Accordance of the Sound and Senſe of every Period. The Numbers therefore muſt be ſmooth or rough, mild or vehement, quick or ſlow, as the Subject varies and requires.—This Matter is conſidered more at large in the following Sheets.

† With regard to the Monotony which attends the Repetition of Couplets, where the Senſe and Sound keep Time exactly together; it is made much more diſagreeable than is neceſſary, by the Neglect of the Poets to introduce that Variety of Numbers of which the Couplet is

On the Whole, as it would be doing the greateſt Injuſtice to the Poets, to make Nonſenſe of their Writings, becauſe they have not been always ſo happy as to make the Sound echo to the Senſe; ſo it would be paying a very bad Compliment to their divine Art, to pretend that, in reciting Poetry, it is at any Time neceſſary to ſacrifice Senſe to Sound *.

capable. Our moſt harmonious and correcteſt Poets have fallen into this Neglect; and particularly Mr. Pope, whoſe Verſes are for the moſt Part compoſed of Hemiſtics, which neceſſarily occaſion a moſt unneceſſary Homotony. But of this hereafter.

* If indeed the Sound is the better of the two, as is not unfrequently the Caſe with the minor Poets, it may not be improper to neglect the worſt: It being a Matter of very little Importance how Nonſenſe is recited.

CHAP.

CHAP. II.

The Analyſis of SPEECH.

SECT. I. *Of Speech in general.*

THE Art of Reading conſiſting in a juſt and unaffected Imitation of natural Speech, it is expedient to enter firſt into a ſhort Analyſis of the Subject imitated: At leaſt, ſo far as the Relation it bears to the imitative Art is concerned.

Speaking may, with Propriety, be diſtinguiſhed into *vocal* and *ſentimental*, agreeable to the two diſtinct Parts of its Compoſition, *Sound* and *Senſe*: The former immediately reſpecting the *Matter*, or common Subject of Speech in general; the latter regarding the *Significancy* and *Energy* of particular Languages.

SECT. II. *Of the vocal Part of Speech.*

The vocal Part of Speech, conſiſts in a diſtinct Succeſſion of articulate Sounds or Voices, which being intended to expreſs and communicate our Affections or Ideas,

muſt, to that End, be neceſſarily uttered with *Preciſion* and *Energy*.

Now, it is not only impoſſible for us to ſpeak with Energy and Preciſion (in other Words, to make ourſelves clearly underſtood) by *a regular* Succeſſion of *uniform* and *unvaried* Sounds *; but it is equally impoſſible for the Organs to utter more than a certain Number of thoſe articulate Sounds, without making ſome Reſt or Pauſe in the Pronunciation.

As there are alſo ſome Sounds more emphatical, or expreſſive of more forcible Affections or Impreſſions than others, ſo the Voice will either dwell *longer* on thoſe

* The Ear cannot be long pleaſed with one and the ſame Sound continued, nor *different Impreſſions be made upon the Soul* by the ſame Motions and Percuſſions of the Air: Therefore *Nature*, or *the Reaſon of Things*, has inſtructed the Voice in every Language not to move by uniform Sounds.

Let us pronounce, for Inſtance, the ten following Syllables with one perpetual Tenor of the Voice, unchanged alike in *Tune* or in *Accent*,

Be what you will ſo you be ſtill the ſame,

and they will appear like ſurd and unmeaning Sounds.

SAY, *on the Harmony, Variety and Power of Numbers.*

Sounds,

Sounds, or will utter them more *forcibly* than the reſt. Hence the Voice, in Pronunciation, will neceſſarily fall into a certain Kind of Modulation, agreeable to the Modification of the Language, and the Formation of the Organs.

SECT. III. *Of the Modulation of* SPEECH, *and the Diſtinction between* SPEAKING *and* SINGING.

There is this Difference between the Modulation of Sound in Speaking and Singing, that the Tones and Cadencies of the *latter* are, by no Means, applicable to the *former*.

I am not to learn that the Ancients, as well as ſome learned and ingenious Critics among the Moderns, have ſuppoſed a Kind of muſical Cadence, as applicable in a certain Degree to *Speaking* and *Reading*, as to *vocal* and even *inſtrumental* Muſic.

I cannot help thinking, however, that we have ſufficient Reaſon for embracing the oppoſite Opinion, and for making an eſſential Diſtinction between Speaking and Singing, by baniſhing all regular Modulation

dulation of Tone or Tune from the former.

We are told by Lord Kaims, in his Elements of Criticiſm, that the five Vowels, with the ſame Extenſion of Windpipe, but with different Openings of the Mouth, form a regular Series of Sounds, deſcending from high to low in the following Order, i, e, a, o, u. His Lordſhip gives it alſo as the Opinion of Dionyſius of Halicarnaſſus, that, in pronouncing *i. e.* without altering the Aperture of the Windpipe, the Voice may vary, and extend itſelf to any Diſtance within the Compaſs of three Notes and a Half.

But if the Anatomiſts be not miſtaken, the Tone of the Voice is compleatly formed before it reach the Mouth, and is not by Articulation made either more *grave* or *acute*. I do not therefore conceive how either the Opinion of Dionyſius, or the Aſſertion of his Lordſhip, can be true.—Indeed, in diſtinguiſhing *Pronunciation* from *Singing*, Lord Kaims himſelf obſerves, "the *latter* is carried on by Notes, "requiring each of them a different Aper-"ture of the Windpipe: While the "Notes belonging to the *former* are ex-

"preſſed

" preſſed by different Apertures of the " Mouth, without varying the Aperture " of the Windpipe *."

His moſt ingenious Friend, however, the Author of *Hermes*, aſſerts, with the Anatomiſts, that Articulation does not alter the Tone; but that " Articulation is, " in fact, nothing elſe than that Form or " Character, acquired to ſimple Voice, " by Means of the Mouth and its ſeveral " Organs, the Teeth, the Tongue, the " Lips †, &c." Now, if this be the Caſe, and the Voice, after coming from the Trachea, be made neither more grave nor acute in Articulation, what Kind of *Notes* can thoſe be, which his Lordſhip ſuppoſes are formed by the Apertures of the Mouth? Neither a *higher* nor *lower* Note can proceed from the Lips of the Mouth, than firſt proceeds from the Lips of the *Glottis*.

He is miſtaken therefore in ſuppoſing the Voice, in paſſing through the Cavity of the Mouth, acquires by Articulation a

* See Elements of Criticiſm, Vol. ii. Page 263. ſecond Edition.

† Hermes, or a Philoſophical Enquiry concerning Language and Univerſal Grammar, Book iii. Chap. 2.

different Tone. It is true in general, as he affirms, " that the Air, in paſſing thro' " Cavities, differing in Size, produceth " various Sounds, ſome high, or ſharp, " ſome low and flat: That a ſmall Cavity " occaſions a high Sound, and a large " Cavity a low Sound." His Lordſhip, however, forgets to take along with him the *Velocity* with which it is neceſſary the Air ſhould paſs through thoſe Apertures, before it can poſſibly occaſion any Sound at all, in its Paſſage.

Dodart with the reſt of the Phiſiologiſts, give us a Reaſon why the Tone of the Voice is formed at the Glottis. Its Aperture is ſo very ſmall, in Compariſon with the Width of the Trachea, that the Air can never get out of the latter without a prodigious Compreſſion, and of courſe an Augmentation of its Velocity; by which Means, in paſſing, it communicates an Agitation to the minute component Parts of the Lips of the Glottis, to which it gives a Kind of Spring, cauſing them to make thoſe Vibrations in the paſſing Air which occaſions the Sound.

Now it is very evident that, in Articulation, the vibrating Air is never ſo compreſſed

preſſed as to acquire a Degree of Velocity capable of altering the Tone it acquired in paſſing through the very ſmall Aperture * of the Glottis. On the contrary, there is a vaſt Diſproportion between that Aperture and the Cavity of the Mouth, where Sound hath Room to vibrate at large. Indeed, it might as well be pretended, that the Tone of the Voice muſt be altered in paſſing through a Caſement, an Entry, or Anti-chamber, as that it may be changed from grave to acute, in paſſing from the Trachea through the Mouth. Such Notes or Sounds may indeed, by Articulation, be rendered *longer* or *ſhorter*, *ſtronger* or *weaker*; but the Tone thereof will remain *unvaried*.

There is this Difference between a muſical Tone and an articulate Sound; that the former is characterized, and takes its Effect from the Velocity of the Vibrations which cauſe it, without regard to the *Sum* or *Duration* of thoſe Vibrations: Whereas the Effect of an articulate Sound depends not only on the Velocity of ſuch Vibrations, or the Number of them in

* About One-tenth of an Inch.

any

any given Time, but on the *whole Sum* of ſuch Vibrations; or, if I may ſo venture to expreſs it, the *Momentum* of the *whole Voice.*

Hence, if a Word, ſpoken in a low Key or Tone, whoſe Vibrations are ſlow, did not longer affect the auditory Nerves than another Word ſpoken in a higher Key, it would be impoſſible they ſhould make the ſame Degree of Impreſſion, *i. e.* be equally articulate and diſtinct †.

I cannot therefore agree with this ingenious Critic, when he ſays, that "this "Difference between Speaking and Sing-"ing doth not hinder Pronunciation *to* "*borrow* from Singing, as a Man ſome-"times is naturally led to do, in expreſ-"ſing a vehement Paſſion." For my Part,

† Let us ſuppoſe, for Inſtance, that the Sound of one Word was naturally an Octave higher than another; we ſhould, in order to pronounce them equally audible and diſtinct, dwell *twice* as long upon the *loweſt* as the *higheſt.* The Vibrations of a Chord being iſochronal, the ſame Note is always ſounded whether thoſe Vibrations be ſtopt or continued; their Diſcontinuance affecting only the Length of the Note. But in Pronunciation it is neceſſary, that the Duration of a Sound ſhould be proportionate to its Tone, in order to make it equally diſtinct with any other of a different Tone.

I muſt

I muſt own, I never ſaw People in a vehement Paſſion more propenſe to *ſing* at thoſe Times, than when they have been leſs agitated. I have heard them *rave* and *ſcold* on thoſe Occaſions moſt vociferouſly; but the Diſcords of harſh and ſmooth prevailed ſo much, that I could diſcover no Traces of the Melody of *Singing*.

I agree with his Lordſhip that, in Reading as well as Singing, there is a Key-Note. But then I conceive its Influence is confined to a Sentence, or capital Part of a Sentence, or Period; and that the Key is changed in Reading as the *Subject* varies: Not that the Voice is elevated and depreſſed on the particular Words of a Sentence pronounced in that *Key*; much leſs do I think that the Voice, at the Cloſe of a Sentence, ſhould, in order to a Reſt, as he ſays, be brought down to the ſaid Key-Note, in the Way of *Cadence*. One of the greateſt Faults in *Reading*, is the Sinking the laſt Word of a Sentence; a Circumſtance never obſervable in *natural Speech*, any further than as the laſt Syllable may be leſs forcible or emphatical than the reſt. Nothing would be more preposterous

poſterous than ſuch a Sinking, merely for the Sake of a muſical Cadence.

Agreeable to this, Quinctilian, in treating of Pronunciation, ſays, that "a ſkilful Maſter will take Care his Pupil "doth not ſuffer the laſt Syllables of a "Word or Sentence to *ſink*; that the "*Whole* of his Diſcourſe may be *alike* "and *even*: When he is to exert his "Voice, let it be known by its *Strength*."

Thus we ſee this great Maſter of Elocution, recommended Evenneſs of Tone and Strength of Voice; not Variety of muſical Cadence. By adopting the latter, indeed, we ſhould, with conſummate Refinement, place *Reading* on a Foot with *Recitative* in Muſic; but till *Speaking* be *Chanting*, and our ordinary Diſcourſe reſemble the Service of a Cathedral, I muſt remain of Opinion, that the Variations of *high* and *low* have nothing to do with particular Syllables in Speaking or Reading.

The *Modulation* of the Voice in Pronunciation conſiſts, then, *Firſt*, in the proper Diverſification of Key at the Beginning of every Sentence, or capital Part of a Sentence, when the Subject is diver-

ſified,

ſified. In which Manner only the Diverſity of *high* and *low* ſhould take place in Speaking or Reading.

Secondly, In the Varieties of long or ſhort, or ſwift and ſlow, applicable both to the articulate Sounds themſelves, and to the Intervals of their Succeſſion. Becauſe ſome Syllables neceſſarily take up more Time in the Pronunciation than others, on Account of the Letters compoſing them: Some Words in a Sentence are leſs important than others, and therefore not ſo long to be dwelt on. And, laſtly, Sentences require to be repeated quicker or ſlower, according to the Nature of the Subject, or their Importance in the Diſcourſe or Compoſition.

Thirdly, In the Diverſifications of *ſtrong* or *weak*, *loud* or *ſoft*, both Words and Sentences require a forcible or emphatical Pronunciation, according to their natural Energy and Importance.

To theſe different Species of vocal Modulation might be added thoſe of *harſh* and *ſmooth*: But as this doth not depend ſo much on the Speaker and Reader, as on the Form of the Language he ſpeaks, and the

the Choice of Words in the Writer, I ſhall here paſs it over.

As to the Change of Key, or the Tone of Voice, in Pronunciation: This, being governed entirely by the *Senſe*, cannot be reduced to any of the mechanical Rules relative to the Melody, or the harmonious Succeſſion, of ſingle Sounds; this Diverſity of Tone by no Means conſtituting that regular Variation of *long* and *ſhort*, *ſtrong* and *weak* Sounds, which have ſo pleaſing an Effect in the Compoſitions of our Orators and Poets.

Its Beauties are, indeed, of a ſuperior Nature, and are often productive of the moſt ſtriking Effects, by interfering or breaking through that metrical Succeſſion or mechanical Regularity of Sounds. Sudden, impetuous, and uncontroulable as the Paſſions it accompanies, its Tranſitions frequently ſurprize, alarm, and confound the Hearer with agreeable Aſtoniſhment. This Subject, however, will be more properly conſidered under the *ſignificant* than the *vocal* Part of Speech.

With regard to the Varieties of *long* and *ſhort*, *ſtrong* and *weak* in Modulation, they come

come under this Head only as they effect the ſeveral articulate Sounds themſelves: The ſwift or ſlow Succeſſion of theſe Sounds depending on the *ſentimental* or ſignificant Part of Pronunciation.

SECT. IV. *Of* ARTICULATION, *or the Times and Powers of diſtinct Voices.*

The Buſineſs of *Articulation*, is to make a Diſtinction in Sounds, be their Tone what it will, thereby to give a diſtinct and audible Utterance to all the ſeveral Voices of which the Words of a Language are compoſed.

By the articulate Voices of a Language, I do not only mean the ſimple elementary Sounds, which are few *; but alſo the infinite Number of Syllables compounded of them, if ſingle, or productive only of one ſimple Sound †.

The

* Buffier ſays there are Twenty-four ſimple Sounds in the Engliſh Language, Twenty in the Spaniſh, Twenty-nine in the Italian, Thirty in the German, and Thirty-three in the French.

† Lord Kaims, indeed, ſays, that every articulate Sound into which a Conſonant enters, muſt neceſſarily be double, though pronounced with one Expiration of the Air,

The Pronunciation of the elementary Sounds of a Language is, to Speaking and Reading, what the Practice of Sol-fa-ing is in Singing; it being as neceſſary for the Speaker or Reader to be able to pronounce diſtinctly each Letter of the Alphabet, as for a Singer to Sound every Note in the Scale of Muſic. As there is no Melody or Harmony alſo in the uniform Utterance of equal Notes; ſo there is (as before obſerved) no Senſe or Expreſſion to be gathered from the uniform Utterance of ſurd and unmeaning Sounds: And yet as theſe are the fundamental and conſtituent Parts of vocal Speech, their Nature and Efficacy come firſt under Conſideration.

Few as theſe elementary Sounds are in moſt Languages, they are not in all exactly the ſame, notwithſtanding the Europeans make Uſe of ſimilar Letters or Types to expreſs theſe Elements in general.

Air, or with one Breath. The Reaſon, however, which he gives for it is, that Conſonants being pronounced with a leſs Cavity of the Mouth than Vowels, they are of a different Tone.

But this Doctrine being refuted in the preceding Section, the Inference drawn from it of Courſe falls to the Ground.

Dif-

Different Nations frequently annex a different Sound to the ſame Type; hence ariſes, in a great Meaſure, that Perplexity and Confuſion among the Learned of different Countries, when they converſe together in the dead Languages: As alſo the great Difficulty Foreigners meet with in learning the Language of their Contemporaries *. Now the different Articulation of a Sound doth not depend on its Tone; it being poſſible to pronounce a Word as diſtinctly in a *low*, as in a *high*, Tone of Voice †.

* Thus the French never pronounce the *Theta* of the Greeks, as the Engliſh and ſome other Nations do. Again, the Engliſh pronounce the Latin different from almoſt all other Nations. *Cæcus*, for Inſtance, they pronounce *Sekus*; while the Italians, on the other Hand, pronounce it *Chekous*. In the German and Low Dutch, *G*, ſo hard in ſome Engliſh Words, is little more than an Aſpirate, while the latter pronounce the double *o* in the Middle of a Word, which with us is ſounded like an *ou*, as an Engliſh *o* long, as in *open*, *gore*, &c. Again, the Sound given by the Engliſh to the double *o*, is given by them to *oe*, as *goed*, *boer*, &c. which they pronounce as we do, *good*, *boor*.

† That is, within the Stretch or Compaſs of the Organs. Thus we ſay, a Spring unbends itſelf with the ſame Force with which it is bent: But it is always underſtood within a certain Degree, conſiſtent with the Form and Elaſticity of it.

To effect this, however, *i. e.* to pronounce a Word, in any Key, equally diſtinct and articulate, it is neceſſary that it ſhould, in every Caſe, have the ſame Efficacy on the Ear; that is, if the Vibrations of its Tone be ſlow and grave, they ſhould continue proportionably longer on the Ear, or be more often repeated than if they were quick and ſharp, and *vice verſa*. Hence ariſes the natural or mechanical Diſtinction between long and ſhort Syllables; it being impoſſible to pronounce all the different articulate Voices of a Language in the ſame Tone, and equally diſtinct, without making them proportionably longer or ſhorter.

At the ſame Time, the Diſtinction of *loud* and *ſoft* ariſes from this very Circumſtance: For if, in uttering two Sounds of the ſame Tone, the one be in Articulation made *long*, and the other *ſhort*, they will not be equally *diſtinct*; but the long one will be heard ſo much *plainer*, as it will be heard *longer* than the other. For it is to be obſerved, that in human Speech, though the primary Organ of Sound acts as a ſimple Monochord; yet it is in our Power, by the Organs of Articulation, the Tongue,

Tongue, Teeth and Lips, to ſhorten the Utterance, and thereby put an End to the Sounds when we pleaſe, juſt as the Vibrations of the Strings of an Harpſichord are ſtopt by taking the Fingers off the Keys. ——It is notorious, that ſingle articulate Sounds or Voices, if pronounced in the ſame Time, would differ from each other in Tone: To pronounce them, therefore, equally diſtinct, with the ſame Aperture of the *Glottis*, or in the *ſame Tone*, they muſt in courſe differ both in *Length* and *Force:* And if pronounced equally *long* and *loud*, they will neceſſarily require to be uttered in different Tones, or with different Apertures of the Glottis.

Now that Succeſſion of Sounds, which is carried on by the different Tones, conſtitutes Singing, ſo that in *Speaking* and *Reading*, the ſame Time being preſerved *; the ſeveral articulate Voices made Uſe of,

* Agreeable to what is above intimated, during a *Sentence*, or ſuch Part of a Diſcourſe as may not require a *Variation* in the Key. A Variation of Keys is, indeed, admitted in the Compoſition of Muſic, and is almoſt as little ſubject to Rule, and as much detached from the mechanical Principles of Melody, as that I would endeavour to eſtabliſh in Reading.

are to be diſtinguiſhed only by their *Length* and *Force* †.

SECT. V. *Of the Length of Syllables in Engliſh.*

The Difference between the elementary Sounds, or articulate Voices, in different Languages, is ſo very conſiderable, that, however general ought our Enquiries into this Subject to be, 'tis impoſſible to purſue them with any Advantage, without limiting them to one particular Language. As this Work, therefore, is in-

† In preſcribing theſe Diſtinctions, however, it is not pretended, that in the Utterance of elementary Sounds and articulate Voices, *ſeverally* and *diſtinct* from each other, we do not naturally pronounce them in different Tones. When we have no Regard to preſerve the general Tone, or Key, of a Sentence or Diſcourſe, it is as eaſy for us to vary the *Tone* as the *Time* of a Sound. Thus, in the Pronunciation of detached Monoſyllables, their Difference in Point of Acuteneſs and Gravity is very ſenſible, unleſs we purpoſely preſerve the Tone, to ſhew how its Diſtinction may be ſupplied by *Time* and *Force*. But when Syllables are joined in Sentences, and form a Diſcourſe, their Difference in Tone is no longer obſervable: Tone only belonging to the Sentence or Diſcourſe in general; the particular Voices of which are diſtinguiſhable only as they are *long* and *ſhort*, *loud* or *ſoft*.

tended

tended more particularly for the Uſe and Emolument of thoſe who are deſirous of Speaking the Engliſh Tongue, and Reading our Engliſh Writers, I ſhall confine myſelf accordingly to my native Language.

Almoſt all thoſe who have hitherto treated of Engliſh Proſody, have contented themſelves with the ſimple Diviſion of Syllables into long and ſhort; pretending that two ſhort Syllables are, with reſpect to Time, preciſely equal to a long one. Nay, ſome have gone ſo far as to aſſert, that no greater Variety of Time in pronouncing Syllables is at all neceſſary for any Kind of Verſe.

It is admitted, indeed, that the Voice is frequently made to reſt longer than commonly on a Word that bears an important Signification; but this, it is pretended, is done to humour the Senſe, and is not neceſſary for Modulation *.

I hope

* See *Harris* on Painting and Poetry, Chap. iii.—Alſo *Say* on the Harmony of Numbers.—*Maſon* on the ſame Subject.—Lord *Kaims*'s Elements of Criticiſm, &c.—The latter obſerves (Vol. ii. Page 377.) that, ſometimes to humour the Senſe, and ſometimes the Melody, a particular Syllable is ſounded in a higher Tone; and this is

I hope to make it ſufficiently plain, however, in the Courſe of this Work, that the Modulation of the Voice, ſo far as it concerns particular Words, in reciting either Proſe or Verſe, depends entirely on the *long* and *ſhort*, *loud* and *ſoft* Manner of pronouncing Words, and not in the *high* and *low* Tones of thoſe Words.

In illuſtrating this Doctrine, it will alſo be found, that Syllables are ſo far from being thus regularly divided into *long* and *ſhort*, that they are naturally of various Lengths. What I mean by *naturally* of various Lengths, is, that they are ſo when Words are pronounced ſeparately and unconnected with the reſt of the Sentence. In

termed *accenting a Syllable*, or gracing it with an Accent. This method of accenting, continues this Writer, is oppoſed to *Cadence*.

Now there cannot be a greater Miſtake, than to ſuppoſe accented Syllables always pronounced in a higher Tone than others. That they are pronounced louder, more forcibly, and ſometimes longer than the reſt, is very true: But nothing is more common than to find an accented Syllable in the very Place where this Writer conceives the Cadence ſhould fall. In a word, *accented* Syllables are pronounced indifferently in all Tones, and, if pronounced aright, always in the ſame Tone as the other Words in the ſame Clauſe or Sentence.

the

the latter Caſe, it is notorious that a Syllable may, from Want of Significance, be made alternately long and ſhort, in Compariſon with others: *e. g.* the Monoſyllables *in* and *Town*, pronounced ſeverally and equally diſtinct, might poſſibly bear the Proportion above-mentioned, the former being about half as long as the latter.

But ſuppoſe it was aſked, WHERE *have you been?* In the Anſwer, *I have been in* TOWN, it is plain their Difference, both in Length and Force, would be increaſed in a very great Proportion; the Word *in* being pronounced ſo ſoftly and quickly as to be hardly audible.

Before I enter, however, on that Diverſity of Length in Syllables, which is cauſed by their being united and modified into Words and Sentences, I ſhall conſider their Nature as ſimple Sounds. And here it is to be previouſly obſerved, that notwithſtanding I baniſh all Variety of *Tone* from Reading and Speaking, except that of Sentences immediately under the Influence of the Meaning of the Diſcourſe; yet it is not pretended that all Syllables, or ſimple Sounds, are of the ſame Tone, or that we ſhould not, in pronouncing

them *ſeverally*, ſound one in a more grave or ſhrill Tone than another.

Let us pronounce, for Inſtance, the following five ſimple Voices, wherein each of the Vowels has the Sound moſt generally given it.

bat, bet, bit, bot, but.

We find that, in uttering theſe diſtinctly and ſeverally, without having any Regard to a general Tone (as we always have in ſpeaking a Sentence) we riſe and fall in their Pronunciation when placed in this Order; by which Means it becomes very evident, that they are not all equally grave or acute. Let us place them in the following Order,

bit, bet, bat, bot, but.

In this Caſe the Voice regularly deſcends from the firſt to the laſt, the Syllable formed by the Vowel *i* being ſharper than that formed by *u*.

How great the Intervals between theſe Tones really are, or whether they are all exactly

exactly equal, is not to the preſent Purpoſe. This is an Object that may be worth the Enquiry of a Compoſer of vocal Muſic. It is ſufficient to the Purpoſes of *Reading*, to know that there are ſuch Diſtinctions, and to ſuppoſe the Intervals equal.

It hath been already obſerved, that articulate Voices are not pronounced equally diſtinct, unleſs their Difference of *Gravity* be compenſated by their *Time*; that is, unleſs a graver Sound be continued proportionably longer than an acute one, and *vice verſa*.

Hence it is plain that, in the equally diſtinct and articulate Pronunciation of theſe ſeveral ſimple Sounds, they muſt all differ in Length; ſo that there muſt *at leaſt* be Syllables of five different Lengths: And this is what I mean by the natural Length of Syllables.

How far, and in what Manner, this natural Meaſure is diverſified in their Combination to form Words and Sentences, in which all the Voices muſt be pronounced in one Tone, will be explained hereafter.

But to proceed in the further Conſideration of ſingle Voices,

It is uſually conceived, that all Monoſyllables are ſingle Sounds.

Scaliger and *Priſcian* define a Syllable to be an Element, or a Comprehenſion of Letters falling under one Accent, and pronounced at once, or at one Motion of the Breath. Others have defined it as an articulate Voice of an individual Sound.

The Difficulty of judging of the Individuality or Singleneſs of a Sound is, however, in ſome Caſes, very perplexing.

The Vowels, when uttered ſingly, are undoubtedly ſingle Sounds; but when united with a Conſonant, or with *more* than *one* Conſonant, have frequently a double Sound.

This hath been accounted for, by pretending, that Conſonants are pronounced with a leſs Cavity of the Mouth than the Vowels; and that, thence having a ſharper Tone, they cannot be pronounced with a Vowel without forming a double Sound, notwithſtanding both are pronounced with one Expiration of Air, or, as it is commonly called, with one Breath. This Reaſon, however, is founded on the Suppoſition, that the Tone of the Voice is altered by Articulation; which being falſe, the

Reaſon

Reaſon of Courſe falls to the Ground. The true State of the Caſe is, that in the Pronunciation of ſome Syllables, the Utterance of the Conſonant cauſes a Kind of a Reverberation of Sound in the Mouth. This is very evident in Syllables ending with Conſonants that cannot be pronounced without cloſing the Lips, or throwing the Tongue againſt the Inſide of the Teeth; by which means Part of the Breath, forming the Sound, remains within the Mouth, and is there ſtifled, or carried through the Noſe. This is plainly experienced in the Pronunciation of the following Syllables, *eb*, *ed*, *el*, *em*, *en*, *et*, &c.

The ſame Reverberation may be experienced alſo, when the Conſonant begins the Syllable, in which Caſe the Lips, or the Tongue, or Teeth, ſtop the Sound in the ſame Manner, till the ſucceeding Vowel ſets it free, *e. g. ma*, *pa*, *fa*, *ta*, &c. this is ſtill more palpable in Syllables beginning with two Conſonants, as *blind*, *frame*, *place*, &c.

It is this Stoppage of the Voice in Articulation, that cauſes that Kind of double

Sound

Sound or half Echo, which, however indiſtinct, neceſſarily prolongs ſuch Syllables.

This double Sound in Monoſyllables is extreamly obſervable when they end with two Conſonants, and particularly two Liquids; as in *curl*, *furl*, *harm*, *warm*, *balm*, *calm*, *helm*, *turn*, *burn*, *morn*, *thorn*, &c. If the Penult, or laſt Letter but one, alſo be a Liquid, and the laſt a Mute, the Syllable will have a double Sound, though ſomething fainter, as in *bilk*, *milk*, *cord*, *lord*, *ſcarf*, *wharf*.

Indeed, a Syllable ending with two Mutes, will, for the Reaſons above given, ſound double, though not ſo long as the former, as is exemplified in *dopt*, *lopt*, *briſk*, *gaſp*, *liſp*, &c.

Again, Monoſyllables ending with an *e* final, have evidently a double Sound when the Penult is a Liquid, particularly if it be an *r*, as *mire*, *fire*, *rare*, *tare*, *here*, *there*, &c.

Add to this, that Diphthongs always give the Syllable a Kind of double Sound; but if it deduce no other from the Conſonants, this is but very weak; the diffe-

rent

rent Sounds of the Vowels meliorating, or mixing with each other much more readily than thoſe of Conſonants.

It is from theſe, and a Number of ſimilar Obſervations, that I have ventured to deduce ſome general Rules reſpecting the *Time* naturally taken up in the Pronunciation of Engliſh Syllables.

SECT. VI. *Rules for determining the natural Length of articulate Voices or Syllables.*

From what hath been advanced in the preceding Section, the Reader will ſee that the Length of Syllables is not altogether arbitrary; but depends in a great Degree on the Acuteneſs or Gravity of the elementary Sounds of which they are compoſed.

It is true, that Cuſtom hath authorized a Number of Anomalies, or Exceptions, to the natural Rules of Pronunciation: And, as that is the *Jus et norma loquendi*, we muſt not rebel againſt ſuch Authority. Perhaps no Reaſon, founded merely on the Nature of Sounds, can be given why the Monoſyllable *Land* ſhould be pronounced in leſs Time than the laſt Syllable in

in the Word *command*. And yet it certainly is ſo. The Poets may call them both long, as they do; but to any Perſon who hath the leaſt Ear, the Difference is ſo palpable as to render ſuch an indiſcriminate Uſe of Times in Poetry a little paradoxical. It is here to be obſerved, however, that in pronouncing the Words *land*, *hand*, &c. we haſten the Articulation of the Voice; while, on the contrary, we evidently retard it in the laſt Syllable of *command* *.

The grammatical Reaſons for ſometimes ſhifting the Accent, on Words ſpelt alike, but of different Meaning, have ſometimes a ſimilar Effect, in cauſing us to ſhorten or prolong the Utterance of the ſame Sounds: Thus in *recor'd*, the Verb, and *rec'ord*, the Noun, the laſt Syllable of the firſt is greatly prolonged, while, in the ſecond, it is hurried out of the Mouth as faſt as poſſible.

* In Fact, the *long*, or, as it is called, *open* Sound of the Vowels, hath the ſame Effect on a Syllable naturally *long*, as a Diphthong has on one naturally *ſhort*. Thus *a*, in *always*, *almoſt*, &c. hath the Sound of *a u*; *o*, in *afford*, hath the ſame Sound as *o a*, in *hoard*; *i*, in *mind* and *kind*, hath the ſame Sound as *a y*, i. e. a double or repeated *i*.

And

And yet, notwithſtanding this, we find, agreeable to what hath been already obſerved, that the Accent does not *lengthen* the ſhort Syllable preceding; *i. e.* it does not make *re* or *rec*, *ree* or *reec*.

But ſetting aſide thoſe Exceptions, from which no general Rules can be free, I conceive the following may enable us to judge pretty accurately of the natural Length of Syllables, when neither accelerated or retarded in the Utterance, for grammatical, oratorical, or poetical Reaſons.

1. The Vowels, when ſingly made uſe of, as Syllables, are long or ſhort, in Proportion to their Difference of Tone, when pronounced without regard to Equality of Time. Thus *a*, being of an intermediate Tone to the other Vowels, is neutral, *i. e.* neither long nor ſhort; *i*, being more acute, is comparatively ſhort; and *o*, being more grave, in like Manner comparatively long. But as neither the Teeth or Lips cloſe in the Articulation of the Vowels, they may all, when uſed ſeparately, be indefinitely long or ſhort; as, in Fact, their Articulation is ended only by ceaſing the Expiration of the Breath.

2. Syl-

2. Syllables beginning or ending, or both beginning and ending, with a ſingle Conſonant, are, very ſtrictly ſpeaking, long or ſhort, according to the Vowel with which the Conſonant is joined. Thus *at*, *bat*, are neutral; *bet*, *bed*, ſhort; *bit*, *bid*, ſtill ſhorter. On the other Hand, *bot*, *god*, are long; and *but*, *bud*, ſtill longer. The Difference, however, in the Length of articulate Voices, ſo ſimple as theſe, is ſo ſmall, that it may be altogether neglected in Reading, without the leaſt Inconveniency, eſpecially as the Modes of lengthening Syllables, by the Combination of a greater Number of Letters, make it neceſſary to form a Scale of a different Order: For, though *bot*, *god*, *but*, *bud*, be longer than *bet*, *bed*, *bid*, *bit*, yet they are not ſo long as *bote*, *gode*, *bute*, *bude*. Again, though *bet*, *bed*, *bid*, *bit*, are ſhort in Compariſon with *bot*, *god*, *but*, *bud*, yet they are much more ſo in Compariſon with others formed of ſhorter Vowels, as *bete*, *bede*, *bide*, *bite*, all which are, nevertheleſs, Monoſyllables; and, though they bear ſomething of a double Sound by their Retardation, are yet to be deemed ſimple articulate Voices, becauſe

becauſe they are pronounced with one Expiration of the Breath.

In the Formation therefore of a proper Scale, ſomething leſs accurate as to Time, I lay it down as a Rule, that all thoſe Syllables which begin or end, or begin and end with a ſingle Conſonant, are naturally *ſhort*, or the ſhorteſt Kind of Syllables.

Theſe are, accordingly, never to be made long by any Accent or Emphaſis whatever.

3. Syllables that begin and end, or that begin or end with two mute Conſonants, are neutral, *i. e.* neither long nor ſhort; nor can they be lengthened by Accent. Thus *apt* cannot, by any Accent, be made long, unleſs the *a* be prolonged into a Diphthong, as *aupt*, or the Aſſiſtance of an *e* final be brought in to make it *aped*.

4. Such Syllables as end with a Vowel are alſo neutral: Theſe, however, may be rendered long by Accent. Thus *Variety*, *various*, &c.

5. Syllables that begin and end, or that begin or end with two liquid Conſonants, or with the laſt Letter but one a Liquid †,

† It is true, that the different Tone of the Vowels have here a very ſenſible Effect: Thus, in the Syllables *ding*, *deng*,

are naturally long, Inſtances of this have been given in the preceding Section.

6. Syllables that end with an *e* final, or an additional *e*, that hath no other Uſe than to lengthen the Sound. Such are, *made*, *fade*, *theſe*, *thoſe*, &c. As to Words ending in *ble*, or *ple*, ſuch as *tremble*, *people*, &c. they are pronounced of the ſame Length as if their final *e* was inſerted between the two preceding Conſonants, and are accordingly ſhort Syllables.

7. Syllables containing genuine Diphthongs * (by which I mean thoſe wherein the

deng, *dang*, *dong*, *dung*, the firſt, i. e. *ding*, muſt neceſſarily be pronounced the ſhorteſt, and the laſt, *dung*, the longeſt, if all are pronounced equally diſtinct.

Hence, the laſt Syllables of our active Participles, *i. e. ing*, is almoſt univerſally ſuppoſed to be ſhort. It may be obſerved, however, that if this Rule be adhered to in Reading, the Reader will pronounce it as if it were written *in*. Thus, he would ſay, *hearin*, *gettin*, *lookin*, &c. But this is a vicious and indiſtinct Method of Pronunciation, and ought to be avoided; as by theſe Means, *hearing* may poſſibly be miſtaken for *herein*, *looking* for *look in*, *getting* for *get in*; and yet this Mode of Pronunciation is taught in many of our Grammars. Mr. Maſon ſays, that a Vowel before two Conſonants is often ſhort; but if he means in the ſame Syllable, and the two Conſonants are pronounced, it is not true.

* That is, in Oppoſition to mere literal or nominal ones, ſuch as are contained in Words, by almoſt univerſal

the Sounds of two Vowels are blended to form a Sound twice as long, or different from either; ſuch are *read, mead, road, toad,* &c.) are always long.

With regard to the Exceptions againſt the above Rules, the arbitrary Diſpoſition of Cuſtom may have authorized many. I will venture to affirm, however, that if theſe Rules were well attended to, there are many Vices of Cuſtom that might be remedied, to the great Improvement of Speaking and *Reading*.

It muſt be alſo obſerved here, that as there is a Difference of Length in the ſhort Syllables, ſo there is a like Difference among the long. This ariſes, however, in an arbitrary Manner from the Circumſtance of the Vowels having all a long, a

ſal Cuſtom, pronounced as if they were ſpelt with one Vowel only; ſuch are, *head, dead, bread,* &c. As alſo in the common Termination of moſt of the Adjectives in Words derived from the Latin, *i. e.* in *ous*, which is almoſt always pronounced ſimply *us*. In like manner, in Words ending in *our* and *ion*, always pronounced *ur* and *ſhun*, the Duplicity of Sound in the Diphthong is entirely loſt. Mr. Maſon, indeed, tells us, that Diphthongs, in Engliſh, are often ſhort. But he can only mean, that they are comparatively ſo by Poſition, or rendered ſo by Want of Significance in the Sentence, not that they are naturally ſo, if genuine Diphthongs.

ſhort, or an open and a cloſe Sound; in other Words, becauſe the Length of their Articulation is indefinite. Hence it is that we ſound ſome Words ſpelt in the ſame Manner, and even the ſame Words, very variouſly. Thus the Words *ford* and *lord* are pronounced of unequal Length, tho' ending with the ſame Letters.

Again, ſome Perſons ſay *wīnd* †, while others ſay *wĭnd*; others *ēnd*, inſtead of *ĕnd*. Nay, there are ſome, and thoſe deemed polite Speakers too, who pronounce even Diphthongs ſhort, as, *herd* for *heard*, *berd* for *beard*, *def* for *deaf*, &c.

In ſome Caſes, grammatical Motives induce this Method of Pronunciation, as in the Verb *read*, whoſe preſent and paſt Tenſe, being ſpelt alike, the latter is pronounced as if was written *red*.

On the Whole, however, it appears, that theſe Modes are, for the moſt part, arbitrary, and are often merely local and tranſitory; ſo that they cannot eaſily be reduced to any regular Syſtem of Pronunciation. Add to this, that having aſcertained the comparative Length of the ſhorter Syl-

† *Wind* is frequently a Rhime to *kind* and *mind* with our beſt Poets.

lables,

lables, agreeable to the ſhorteſt or cloſe Sound of the Vowels, the Length of the *longer* muſt certainly be conformable to the ſame Standard. Thus the Syllable *wind*, whether pronounced ſhort or long, in *polite Converſation*, is accounted long in the Meaſure of poetical Quantity. And the Words *hand* and *lord* are accounted long, in the ſame manner as the laſt Syllables in the Words *command* and *afford*, for the ſame Reaſons.

That theſe Anomalies are purely arbitrary and irregular, alſo appears from hence, that it is not in the Power of Emphaſis or Accent to make them in Articulation equally long, without a palpable Drawling or Retardation of the Voice, is very evident to ſuch as have been accuſtomed to pronounce ſuch Words ſhorter. On the other hand, Perſons uſed to ſay *heard*, *beard*, *deaf*, conceive it a mighty finicking, mincing Method to ſay *herd*, *berd*, *def*, &c.

The Inſignificancy of theſe Variations is, indeed, perceptible enough in ſome Inſtances, particularly in thoſe laſt mentioned; it being a Matter of no very great Conſequence to the Propriety and Energy

of Speech, let them be pronounced either Way: But when we come to Modes of long and very general ſtanding, as in the Pronunciation of the laſt Syllable in the Words *afford* and *command*, we ſhould be ſuppoſed to break through all the Rules of Proſody, ſhould we pronounce them as in the Words *Lord* and *Land* *.

Our very beſt Poets, nevertheleſs, make no Scruple of Rhiming with ſuch Sounds; ſo that, from their Example, and for the Reaſons above given, no proſodical Diſtinction is made between them.

SECT. IV. *Of the Nature and Uſe of Accent.*

In the Definition of Accent, ſome modern Writers have followed the Ancients, in pretending that it hath only to do with the Inflections, or the *high* and *low* Tone of the Voice: Others again confine it altogether to Time; while a third Party ſay, it conſiſts *principally*, if not altoge-

* Hence the Diſtinction between true and falſe Diphthongs, Cuſtom having in ſome Words rendered them merely typical; thus in *bread*, *dead*, &c. the Sound of the *a* is altogether ſuppreſſed in London, though not in ſome of the Provinces.

ther,

ther, in the Loudneſs or Softneſs of its Articulation.

The Rhetoricians, indeed, object to this laſt Aſſertion, pretending, that in this Caſe we confound *Accent* with Quantity. This, however, is not ſtrictly true; but ſuppoſing it were, as it is generally agreed that Accent chiefly determines the Quantity of Engliſh Syllables, where is the Impropriety †? Certain it is, that a Syllable may be very forcibly accented, and preſerve the very ſame Tone of every other unaccented Syllable in the Sentence.

If there be ſo great a Difference between the Proſody of the Ancients, and that of modern Languages, that it is confeſſedly in vain to think of introducing the Rules of the former into the latter, why muſt we ſtrictly adhere to their Diſtinctions of Accent and Quantity, in direct Oppoſition to our own Ears, and the Dictates of common Senſe?

† If Quantity be, as Mr. Johnſon, Mr. Sheridan, and Others ſay, "the Meaſure of *Time* in pronouncing a Syl-"lable," and if that *Quantity* be chiefly determined (according to Lord Kaims, Say, Maſon, and Others) by the Accent, how can it be pretended, that Accent hath only to do either with the Acuteneſs or Gravity of the Tone, or with the Length, of a Syllable?

I think it hath been made ſufficiently clear in the preceding Sections, that Engliſh Syllables are naturally of different Lengths; and that their Length cannot, in many Caſes, be altered by Accent.

It is admitted, indeed, that Accent hath a conſiderable Influence over their Length, when they are formed into Words and Syllables; it remains, therefore, to enquire what this Influence is, and how far it extends.

It hath been ſaid, that "Common Uſe "and Cuſtom will never fail to determine "the Accent; the Senſe of the Period "when underſtood, will always point out "the Emphaſis; and where the Accent "or Emphaſis is thus directed to fall, "that Syllable (be its natural Quantity "what it will) is, in that Place conſi-"dered as long; and thoſe Syllables that "have neither Accent or Emphaſis, are "conſidered as ſhort*".

It

* Maſon on the Power of Numbers, Page 11.—There is ſome Impropriety alſo in ſpeaking of Emphaſis and Accent as indiſcriminately falling on *Syllables*, Emphaſis reſpecting nothing leſs than *whole Words*, except in ſome very particular Caſes, where the Emphaſis and Accent are

It might be aſked here, however, what is meant by the Term *conſidered* ſhort or long? Would the Writer perſuade the Reader to pronounce them ſo?—I have already ſhewn in ſeveral Inſtances that he could not.

To give a Syllable, therefore, naturally and unalterably ſhort, an equal Degree of Force with another naturally long, it muſt be pronounced proportionably louder. And thus it is that *Time* and *Force* reciprocally compenſate each other in the Compoſition of Engliſh Quantities; even as in the Compoſition of Motion, the Matter and Velocity may reciprocally ſupply the Place of each other in forming the Momentum of the Whole, a ſmall Quantity of Matter moving with a great Velocity, being equal to a greater Quantity moving proportionably ſlow.

It is juſt the ſame in the Quantities of Engliſh Syllables, and we might as well ſay, that the Velocity of a moving Body is not eſſential to its Motion, as that the na-

are placed on different Syllables of the ſame Word, to enforce the Antitheſis of the Senſe. Thus, *A Convérſion! no — it was a Pérvérſion. — He turned, yes, and rétúrned.*

tural

ral Length of Syllables is not eſſential to diſtinct Pronunciation.

Hence it is plain, that the ſame Quantity of Sound, or Force of Accent, may be laid upon a ſhort Syllable as on a long one, and, *vice verſa*, without prolonging the one, or contracting the other. And here we have the Reaſon why an accented ſhort Syllable may, in *Engliſh* Verſe, ſupply the Place of a long one unaccented, without Injury to the Rythmus, or Meaſure.

It was for Want of duly conſidering the Nature of this Subject, that Mr. Sheridan, while he ſeverely cenſures the *palpable* and *groſs Miſtakes* of our Dictionary Makers in placing the Accent, falls into the moſt egregious Miſtakes himſelf.

This Writer, after making a Diſtinction between the ancient and modern Accents, as far as regarded the Inflections, or muſical Tones of the Voice, proceeds to inform us, that the Term Accent, in the Engliſh, means only a peculiar Manner of diſtinguiſhing one Syllable of a Word from the reſt. This Diſtinction, ſays he, is made by us in two Ways; either by dwelling longer upon one Syllable than the reſt, or by giving it a ſmarter Percuſſion

of

of the Voice in Utterance. So that *Accent* with us, continues he, is not referred to *Tune*, but to *Time*; to *Quantity*, not *Quality*.

" It is by the Accent chiefly (ſays this " Author) that the Quantity † of our " Syllables is regulated; but not accord- " ing to the miſtaken Rule laid down by " all who have written on that Subject, " that the Accent always makes the Syl- " lables long, than which there cannot " be any Thing more falſe. For the two " Ways of diſtinguiſhing Syllables by Ac- " cent, as mentioned before, are directly " oppoſite, and produce quite contrary " Effects; the one, by dwelling on the " Syllable, neceſſarily makes it long; the " other, by the ſmart Percuſſion of the " Voice, as neceſſarily makes it ſhort. " Thus the firſt Syllables in *glory*, *father*, " *holy*, are long, whilſt thoſe in *battle*, " *habit*, *borrow*, are ſhort *."

Mr. Sheridan is certainly right when he ſays, that the Accent does not relate to Tune, nor doth always make Syllables

† Meaning only the Time.

* See Sheridan's Lectures on Elocution, Lect. ii.

long;

long; but when he affirms, that it relates ſolely to the *Time* or Length of our Syllables, he is greatly miſtaken; for, as I have ſhewn above, the *Quantity* of a Syllable in Pronunciation, is the whole Momentum of the Sound producing it, and not merely the Time of its Utterance.

I ſhould be glad alſo to know the Effect of his ſecond Method of accenting Syllables. Will the ſmart Percuſſion, he ſpeaks of, render the Tone more acute, or only more loud? If the former, it hath ſomething to do with *Tune*. But the Truth is, that all accented Syllables, whether long or ſhort, are pronounced fuller or louder than others. Suppoſing them, therefore, to be all accented equally, *i. e.* to be pronounced equally diſtinct and emphatical, the *long* will not be ſo loud as the *ſhort*, their Force being inverſely proportional to their Length. Their natural Length, however, would not, in this Caſe, be neceſſarily altered; for they would not be *ſhort*, becauſe they were *loud*; but *loud*, becauſe they were *ſhort*.

If the Syllables ſpecified alſo be long and ſhort in the Words he mentions, it is for the Reaſons given in the preceding Section.

Section. The Syllables *glo*, *fa*, *ho*, in *glory*, *father*, *holy*, are naturally neutral; and, being accented, are long. Again, *bat*, *hab*, *bor*, in *battle*, *habit*, *borrow*, are, agreeable to the ſame Rules, naturally ſhort, and cannot be lengthened by the Accent.

Mr. Sheridan, indeed, tells us, that "the Quantity (meaning the *Time*) depends on the *Seat* of the Accent, whether it be on the Vowel or Conſonant; if, on the Vowel, the Syllable is neceſſarily long, as it makes the Vowel long; if on the Conſonant, it may be either long or ſhort, according to the Nature of the Conſonant, or the Time taken up in dwelling upon it. If the *Conſonant* be in its *Nature* a *ſhort* one, the Syllable is neceſſarily ſhort. If it be a *long* one (that is, one whoſe Sound is capable of being lengthened) it may be long or ſhort at the Will of the Speaker †."

Now,

† By a ſhort Conſonant, ſays Mr. Sheridan, I mean one whoſe Sound cannot be continued after a Vowel; ſuch as *c*, or *k*, *p*, *t*, as *ac*, *ap*, *at*; whilſt that of long Conſonants can, as *el*, *em*, *en*, *er*, &c. Now, nothing is more certain

Now, nothing can be more abſurd than to ſuppoſe the Length of Syllables determined chiefly by the Accent, as if Syllables

certain than, that the *latter* are *ſingle articulate Voices* as well as the former: And if there be any Difference in their Length, on Account of the ſofter Ending of the Liquids, it is ſo little as not to be worth Notice. As to the *Continuation of the Sound of a Conſonant after a Vowel*, I ſhould be glad to know, whether it be contained in the Articulation of the Syllable, or continued indiſtinctly afterwards. If the *former*, the Sound of the *Vowel* muſt be lengthened, as Conſonants, whether liquid or mute, have no other Sound than what they poſſeſs by virtue of their Union with ſome Vowel. If the *latter*, ſuch a Continuation of indiſtinct Sound is a Vice in Pronunciation. We may, indeed, continue to *hiſs* after an *s*, to *yell* after an *l*, to *hum* after an *m*, to *ſnarl* after an *r*, &c. But to adopt ſuch Practices, and lay them down as Rules of Oratory and Proſody, is ſomewhat extraordinary!

If Mr. Sheridan's long Conſonants would make the preceding Vowel long, then, indeed, they might be ſaid to lengthen the Syllable. *P* is a ſhort Conſonant, and *l* a long one; and yet, diſtinctly pronounced, *ap* and *al* are, to my Ears, equally long, or, as I before obſerved, very nearly ſo; whereas, if this ſuppoſed long Conſonant were to lengthen the Syllable, *al* ſhould certainly have the Sound of *all* or *ale*; *el* ſhould ſound long as *eel*, *em* as *eem*, *en* as *een*, &c.

Again, Mr. Sheridan places *s* among his *ſhort* Conſonants, though its Sound may be continued almoſt indefinitely; and *m* among his *long* ones, though the Lips muſt be fairly cloſed in its Pronunciation, and its Sound, if continued, be neceſſarily forced through the Noſe.

bles

bles had no natural Meaſure of their own, and at the ſame Time to conceive that ſingle Conſonants poſſeſſed ſuch a natural Difference, and that ſo great, as to determine the Efficacy of the Accent on the whole Syllable. Since when is it that Conſonants have had any Sound at all independent of the Vowels? The Seat of the Accent being fixed upon the laſt Letter of a Syllable, is alſo as great an Innovation; for *Accent* belongs not to *Letters* but *Syllables*, as *Emphaſis* to *Words*, and *Tones* to *Sentences*.

If we change the Seat of the Accent in the above Inſtances, Mr. Sheridan ſays, we ſhould change the Quantity of the Syllables. Thus, if we ſay *glor'y* for *glóry*, *fat'her* for *fáther*, *hol'y* for *hóly*, the firſt Syllables would become ſhort. As, on the other Hand, were we to dwell on the Vowels inſtead of the Conſonants in the laſt Inſtances, they would change from ſhort to long. As, for Inſtance, if inſtead of *bat'tle* we ſhould ſay *bà ttle*, for *hab'it*, *hà bit*, and for *bórrow*, *bò rrow*; and this, continues Mr. Sheridan, "is one of the "chief Sources of the Difference between "the *Scotch* and *Engliſh* Gentlemen in the

"Pro-

" Pronunciation of Engliſh." But what does all this prove? In Reality, nothing more than that thoſe, who know not how to ſpell, or to divide Engliſh Words into Syllables, may be aſſiſted by the Poſition of the *accentual Type* or *Mark* in Reading, but does by no Means prove that the Length of Syllables depends on the Poſition of that Mark; for, as to the Force of the Accent, it lies on the *whole Syllable*, and doth not *belong*, as this Writer affirms, to a particular Letter in ſuch Syllable.

Indeed, a Reader muſt know very little of the Orthography, or Orthoepy, of any Language, who ſhould divide the Words *battle* and *borrow* into Syllables thus, *ba-ttle*, *bo-rrow*, which they muſt do to pronounce them as Mr. Sheridan ſuppoſes.

There are ſome Words, indeed, which Strangers, without knowing the Manner of accenting them, might divide thus miſtakenly, and thence be induced to make thoſe Syllables long, which are uſually pronounced ſhort, and *vice verſa*. Thus in *habit*, which, without any manifeſt orthographical Impropriety, might be ſyllabiſed and pronounced by a Foreigner *há bit*, as well as *hab it*. But though the Seat of

the

the Accent may direct us in the proper Diviſion of Words into Syllables, or articulate Voices, the Force of it does, by no Means, reſt on particular Letters, nor can it be arbitrarily placed on them at random, without regard to the natural Method of dividing Words into Syllables, which depends on the Diſpoſition of the Vowels and Conſonants compoſing ſuch Words; *e. g.* in *venture, center, random, handſome,* it is impoſſible, conſiſtent with the Orthoëpy of any Language, to divide theſe Words into Syllables, ſo as, in Speaking, to ſeparate the firſt Vowel from the ſucceeding Conſonant. So that whether the Accent ſhould be laid on the firſt Syllable, or the laſt, of theſe Words, they can never be divided into articulate Sounds, otherwiſe than thus, *ven-ture, cen-ter, ran-dom, hand-ſome*; or thus, *vent-ure, cent-er, rand-om, hands-ome.*

What Mr. Sheridan means by the *Seat* of the *Accent* may, indeed, be worth attending to, as the Poſition of that Mark, in Orthography, may ſerve to ſhew when the Vowel hath its long or *iterated* Sound, and when it hath its ſhort or *ſingle* one. Thus in *warmly, warlike, hardly, tardy,*

kindly, *mindful*, &c. it might not be improper to ſet the accentual Mark on the Vowels in the firſt Syllable. On the other hand, in ſuch Words as, *handful*, *manly*, *kindle*, it might be proper to place it on the Conſonant ſucceeding the Vowel.

But what hath all this to do with the Nature and Uſe of Accent in general? Will any one pretend that the firſt Syllables in *handful*, *manful*, *kindle*, are not equally accented with the firſt Syllables in *warmly*, *warlike*, *hardly*, *kindly*, *mindful*, &c.

It is further obſerved, by this Writer, that "no Vowel hath a long Sound in an "unaccented Syllable:" From which he concludes, that if this Article of Accent were properly adjuſted, it would prove a Maſter-Key to the Pronunciation of our whole Tongue.

Now, I am of Opinion that the Maſter-Key to Pronunciation is the Knowledge of the natural Length of articulate Sounds, conceiving that, if Mr. Sheridan had examined this Affair to the Bottom, he would have found that the Seat of the Accent depends more frequently on the Length of the Syllables, than the Length of Syllables on the Accent.

Inſtead

Inſtead of ſaying, therefore, that no Vowel ever has a long Sound in an unaccented Syllable; he might, with equal Propriety, have ſaid, every Syllable, in which the Vowel hath a long Sound, is accented. But the Fact is, that neither the one nor the other is true, as may be proved in numerous Inſtances *.

I ſhall mention only a few, in Words both of two and three Syllables, where the Accent lies on the firſt Syllable, and none on the ſecond or laſt, wherein the Vowel, nevertheleſs, preſerves its long Sound: Such are *contrite*, *deluge*, *empire*, *exile*, *finite*, *female*, *fortune*, *gangrene*, *proſtrate*, *attribute*, *authorize*, *concubine*, *diſſipate*, *ſervitude*, &c. Will it be ſaid that Words ending with an *e* final muſt not be conſidered as comprehended in this Rule, becauſe that this Vowel, though in itſelf mute, always makes a Syllable long? I anſwer, that though it frequently makes Syllables long, it does not always ſo †;

* And yet Mr. Sheridan lays it down as an *infallible* and *invariable* Rule. See his Lectures.

† Witneſs *are*, *were*, *famine*, *engine*, *motive*, *juſtice*, and many others, in which the *e* final, though annexed in *Writing*, is totally mute in Speaking.

and yet, though it does not neceſſarily give the preceding Vowel its long Sound †, there are Syllables which it nevertheleſs makes long, though unaccented: And theſe form ſuch a Number of *Exceptions*, as, to a pretended *infallible* and *invariable* Rule, amounts to a Contradiction of the Rule itſelf.

But Mr. Sheridan goes ſtill farther, and ſays, whenever the Accent is on the Conſonant (that is, generally when the Conſonant ends the Syllable) the Sound, not only of the preceding Vowel, is always ſhortened, but no other Vowel in the Word has ever its full long Sound. I have inſtanced the contrary, however, in the Words *contrite*, *deluge*, *empire*, *exile*, &c. To which may be added numerous other Examples, in which the *e* final is not concerned; ſuch are *echo*, *arrow*, *cargo*, *enſign*, *compound*, &c. Would Mr. Sheridan have theſe Words pronounced *cóntrĭt*, *délŭdg*, *emˊpĭr*, *exˊĭl*, *ecˊhŏ*, *arˊro*, *cárgŏ*, *enˊsĭn*, *cómpŭnd*?

If this Improver of the Engliſh Language, indeed, had pretended to take the

† Thus in *challenge*, *entrance*, *incenſe*, &c. the Vowels in the laſt Syllable (though naturally long, as having the *e* mute annexed) have not the long Sound of the Vowel.

Sound

Sound of our Words from the curſory and and colloquial Pronunciation of the Unlearned, he might have laid down ſuch Rules with ſome Kind of Propriety *, as, in common Converſation, the long and ſhort Sound of the Vowels are frequently thus confounded. Hence, People may ſometimes ſay *em'pĭr* for em'pīre, *en'sĭn* for en'sīgn; but then no Difference is made between the long Sound of the *i* in that Word, and the ſhort one in *engine*, *famine*, &c.

The colloquial Pronunciation of our Language, however, as Mr. Johnſon very juſtly obſerves, is always vague and uncertain, being made different in different Mouths by Negligence, Unſkilfulneſs, or Affectation.

* As to the Word *cómpound*, however, it is hardly in the Power of the moſt precipitate Speaker to ſhorten it, even in Converſation. There are alſo many other Words of the ſame Kind in our Language, which contradict the general Rule, that but one Accent is placed on Words of two Syllables; ſuch are *convoy*, *conſort*, *concourſe*, *diſcord*, *falſhood*, *farthing*, *furlong*, *hemlock*, *impulſe*, *inqueſt*, *inſtinct*, *linguiſt*, *offspring*, *ſhipwreck*. To theſe, we may add almoſt all the other Words compounded of two Monoſyllables; as *earthquake*, *quickſand*, *ſackcloth*, *lukewarm*, *hailſtone*, &c.

The Cauſe of Mr. Sheridan's Miſtake in theſe Particulars, appears to be his falling into a fundamental Error reſpecting the *Nature* of Engliſh *Accent*, by conceiving it to be the ſame Thing with the ancient Quantity or *Time*. I ſhall endeavour to ſet this important Article, therefore, in a true Light; To which End I ſhall apply rather to the mechanical Theory of Speech, as founded on actual Obſervation, and the Principles and Experiments of natural Philoſophy, than to the Practices of the Ancients, or Opinions of claſſical Authority.

The Intent and Uſe of emphaſizing and accenting particular Words and Syllables in a Sentence, are evidently to render them more diſtinct, or to convey them more forcibly to the Ear, in order to preſent their Meaning in a ſtronger Light to the Underſtanding, as more important and ſignificant than that of the reſt.

Now, there are two Circumſtances abſolutely eſſential to the Purpoſes of Speech, and therefore more particularly ſo to every Word that is accented. 1ſt. That it ſhould be heard. 2d. That it ſhould be heard articulately.

With

With regard to the *firſt*, or the *Audibility* of Speech, it can be increaſed or diminiſhed only by increaſing or diminiſhing the *Force* of it.

From the Neglect of Writers on this Subject, to make a proper Diſtinction between the *Tone* and *Force* of the Voice, it is not very unreaſonable to infer, that they were ignorant of it, or at leaſt of its great Importance to Pronunciation. It is well known, however, to Perſons ever ſo little acquainted with experimental Philoſophy, that a Sound may paſs through various Degrees of *loud* and *ſoft*, without altering its Tone.

It is certain, that whether a Monochord be ſtruck violently or gently, its Vibrations being iſochronal, the Tone of its Sound muſt be conſtantly the ſame, though it will be loudeſt when firſt ſtruck, and gradually decreaſe, in Loudneſs, at every Vibration, till its Sound totally dies away.

It is true, indeed, that a ſhrill or acute Sound is generally more audible, or better heard, and at a greater Diſtance, than a grave one; but this is, becauſe the acute Sounds are commonly ſounded louder in

Proportion than grave ones: The Reaſon of which is, that the Effort, or Stroke, which may be ſufficient to ſtretch an *acute*-ſounding Chord to its utmoſt Extent, will be able to ſtretch a *grave*-ſounding one to but a *ſmall Part* of that Extent. As the Loudneſs of a Tone, therefore, depends on the Extent * to which the Chord is ſtretched, it is plain, that the ſame Effort to ſpeak in a high Tone will have a greater Effect than if made in a low one.

Hence ariſes the common Error of ſuppoſing acute Tones naturally louder than grave ones; whereas, the higheſt Note of a Harpſichord may be ſo ſtruck as ſcarcely to be heard, and the loweſt ſo as to make the whole Houſe reſound.

It is plain from hence, that if Accent had only to do with *high* and *low*, as ſome pretend †, the accented Syllables in a Word or Sentence might be pronounced with Propriety, and yet in ſuch a Man-

* That is in Proportion to its *Length*; the Stroke that will ſometimes cauſe a *ſhort* String to vibrate ſeveral Times, and yield a long Note, being incapable of moving a *long* one with ſufficient Velocity to make any Sound at all.

† See Chambers's Dictionary, under the Words *Accent*, and *Tone*.

ner

ner as not to be heard, while all the reſt might be diſtinctly audible. What Work this would make in Speaking or Reading Engliſh, or how far it agrees with our Notions of Accent, I leave every Engliſhman to judge. Theſe Conſiderations induce me to conclude, that Accent in Engliſh, is ſo far from having only to do with *high* and *low*, that, ſtrictly ſpeaking, it hath nothing to do with high and low at all.

We ſhall examine next how far the Audibility of Sound hath to do with *Time*.

Nothing is more certain, than that we can neither hear, ſee, or feel any Thing whoſe Preſence or Effect is inſtantaneous; it is neceſſary that every Object deſcribe a certain Quantity of Space or Time before it can poſſibly be perceived.

Now, in acute Tones, the Vibrations of the Air being quicker than in grave ones, it is certain, that the *acute* Tone will ſooner conſtitute any determinate Momentum of Sound than the *grave* one. As it is plain, however, that the grave one, in *due Time*, would conſtitute the like Momentum, it is evident that Time and Tone, as before obſerved, may reciprocally compenſate, or ſupply the Place of each other in the For-

mation

mation of Accent, which is, for the ſame Reaſons, a moſt palpable Compound of both. And thus the ſhorteſt Syllables may be accented as ſtrongly as the longeſt, and the longeſt as feebly as the ſhorteſt; that is, within the *Bounds* of *Articulation*: For it is to be obſerved, that very ſtrong or *loud* Sounds, as well as very weak or ſoft Sounds, are equally inarticulate: Thus, in converſing through a *Speaking Trumpet*, the louder the Voice is, the more inarticulate it grows.

We come now to conſider, therefore, *ſecondly*, the diſtinct *Articulation* of Speech.

And here it is firſt to be obſerved, that as the *Audibility* of Speech doth not depend merely on the *Tone* of Voice, ſo its *Articulation* depends as little on its Force: For a very *weak* or *low* Voice (though not ſo audible, or to be heard at ſo great a Diſtance) may be equally articulate with the ſtrongeſt or loudeſt Voice, the Extremes of both being *grumbling* or *whiſpering*, and *roaring* or *hooting*.

As accented Syllables, therefore, are required not only to be *audible*, as *mere Sounds*, but alſo to be diſtinctly ſo, as *articulate* Voices, the Preſervation of a due

Tenor

Tenor * or Medium of Voice in Speaking or Reading, is abſolutely eſſential to a good Pronunciation. Hence it is, that when Perſons ſpeak louder † than ordinary, they have not the ſame Command of Voice, nor ſpeak ſo diſtinctly and intelligibly as when they ſpeak more ſoftly. It is proper, therefore, for ſuch as would ſpeak articulately, to avoid both the *mincing* and *mouthing* Mode of Pronunciation, particularly in their Utterance of accented Syllables, or emphatical Words.

As to the farther Uſe of the *Accent* in combining Syllables into Words, ſo much inſiſted on by Mr. Sheridan, I ſhall ſhew the Futility of it at large in the next Section.

* Not a muſical Tenor or Medium between high and low Tones, but a Medium between the *loud* and the *ſoft*; of which every Perſon muſt form a Judgment from the uſual Diſtance at which he is heard, and the Effort he uſually makes without ſtraining the Organs.

† By louder, alſo, is not meant in a higher Tone, but with greater Force or Energy.

Sect. VIII. *Of the Seat of the Accent, and its pretended Uſe in the Formation of Words.*

The Uſe of Accent, in our Language, ſays Mr. Sheridan, is not confined to Quantity alone; but it is alſo the chief Mark by which Words are diſtinguiſhed from Syllables. Or rather, ſays he, it is the very *Eſſence* of *Words*, which, without that, would be only ſo many Collections of Syllables: Monoſyllables being, according to this Writer, mere articulate Sounds, unleſs they are accented. It is true, he admits that this Manner of diſtinguiſhing Words from mere Syllables, is not neceſſary, nor the only Way by which it can be done. He prefers it, nevertheleſs, to the natural Method of making a perceptible Pauſe between each Word, agreeable to the Practice of all modern Nations. If he had duly conſidered this Matter, however, I conceive he would have found it impoſſible to ſpeak or read diſtinctly, without making ſome little Pauſe between every Word *. It is well

* This Pauſe may be indefinitely ſhort, provided it be ſufficient to diſtinguiſh the Ending of the Words from the Ending

worth the Pains to enquire, continues this Writer, which of theſe Methods are the beſt, " as it may turn our Attention to a " Point hitherto little conſidered, and yet " which is one of the greateſt Perfections " of which our Language has to boaſt."

Now nothing is more certain, than that this ſuppoſed Perfection is altogether chimerical. He tells us, indeed, that there cannot be a more evident or preciſe Diſtinction than this of Accent, nor one which can be executed with more Eaſe and Certainty: It requires no Nicety of Ear, as in the diſtinguiſhing of Tones, or meaſuring of *Time*; it only demands that one Syllable ſhould have greater Streſs laid on it than others †: For " if any one " places *two equal Accents* on the ſame " Word, it ſounds to our Ear like two " Words."

Now, for aught that appears in Mr. Sheridan's Lectures, it is poſſible to ac-

Ending of the Syllables; ſo that it need not be productive of that diſguſting Tedioufneſs this Writer ſuppoſes.

† Is this altogether conſiſtent with Mr. Sheridan's referring it to *Time*, and not to *Tune*? Or with his twofold Method of accenting Syllables, one of which conſiſts in dwelling longer upon one Syllable than the reſt?

cent

cent a Syllable *equally* in either of his Modes; for if a Syllable be *dwelt upon* proportionably long, it will be accented as ſtrongly as if he had laid a quick Streſs on it, by what he calls his *ſharp Percuſſion*. Be this, however, as it will, I may venture ſafely and boldly to deny, that "we always hear as many Words as "we hear Accents, or that Engliſh "Words, properly pronounced, have no "more than *one* Accent."

The Advocates for this Scheme may ſtickle, indeed, for the *Inequality* of the *Accent* placed on two different Syllables of the ſame Word *; but I will appeal to every

* Mr. Sheridan admitting that the longer Polyſyllables have two Accents, the one, however, ſo much weaker than the other, as to ſhew that the Syllables are all included in one Word. As a Proof of this, he quotes the ſingle Word *expoſtulatory*. But what will he ſay to the Words *accident, monument, artifice, abrogate*, and a Thouſand others. Will it be ſaid, that the ſtrongeſt Accent lies on the firſt Syllable? Let us then add a Syllable to each, and ſay *accidental, monumental, artificial, abrogation:* The Accent now becomes ſtronger on the third Syllable; but can it be conſiſtent with a proper Method of Pronunciation to ſink the firſt ſo much as to confirm the Rule in Queſtion? The Abſurdity of this Notion will appear farther, if we reflect on the principal Uſe of Accent and Emphaſis, which is to enforce the moſt ſignificant Syllables

every Perſon that hath an Ear, whether ſuch Difference will juſtify this Writer's laying down ſuch a Propoſition as a fundamental Rule, upon which the very Eſſence of our Words depends, and which is ſo univerſal, that there is not a ſingle Exception to it in our whole Language, when the Words are properly pronounced.

How would Mr. Sheridan, for Inſtance, pronounce the Words following? *Acquieſce, appertain, cavalcade, circumvent, condeſcend, diſallow, immature, magazine, maſquerade, reconcile.* Theſe, and many other Words, are ſet down in our Vocabularies, as being accented on the *laſt* Syllable. Again, others are ſet down as accented on the *firſt* Syllable; ſuch are *architect, aqueduct, beautify, circumſpect, enterprize, interview, intimate, intercourſe, manifold, manuſcript, orthodox, retrogade,* &c.

It is very evident, however, on a bare Repetition of theſe Words, that they

lables and Words. Now to make one Accent in Polyſyllables, like Aaron's Serpent, ſwallow up the reſt, is to defeat the firſt and principal End of all Energy in Pronunciation. See this Matter farther explained in the Text.

might

might change Liſts *, or, with the ſame Propriety, be put into one. They are all, indeed, equally accented both on the firſt and the laſt, and very juſtly ſo; for, if the End of Emphaſis and Accent be to convey the moſt ſignificant Parts of Sentences and Words forcibly and diſtinctly to the Ear, no Reaſon can be given why the firſt and laſt Syllables in theſe Words ſhould not be equally accented.

Nothing, indeed, can be more deſtructive of the principal End and Inſtitution of Accent and Emphaſis, than the Practice of huddling the ſignificant Syllables of a Word together, in order to lay a ſingle Accent on one, perhaps the moſt inſignificant of the Whole. Yet nothing is more frequent than this vicious Practice, which Mr. Sheridan's Rules naturally tend to promote. Thus, in forming Derivatives of four Syllables from Words of three, the Streſs of the Accent is generally encreaſed upon the third, (as that Writer recommends) and diminiſhed on the firſt. By this Me-

* Indeed they frequently do ſo, as may be ſeen by comparing any two of our Nomenclatures, Grammars, or Spelling Books.

thod,

thod, however, the Meaning of the Word is totally obſcured: Thus from *cavalcade* and *maſquerade*, ſhould we form *cavalcading*, *maſquerading*, and pronounce them after this erroneous Manner, the ſignificant Parts of the Word would be hurried over, to ſwell the Sound of a mere expletive or *formal* Syllable, common to all Words ſo modified, as is the Caſe in Words ending in *ation*; thus *exclamátion*, *fermentátion*, *viſitátion*, *naturalizátion*.

Is it not contrary to the very Purpoſes of Speech, and even to common Senſe, to pretend, that the Sounds of the firſt Syllables of theſe Words, on which their Meaning ſolely depends, ſhould be weaker than the formal *ma*, *ta*, *za*, which are common to a thouſand Words of different Meanings?

It is really amazing to ſee how a Number of ingenious Men can ſucceſſively ſkim over a Subject, without ever once dipping beyond the Surface, or really enquiring into that Propriety to which they make ſuch pompous Pretenſions. We laugh, as the Satiriſt obſerves, at a Parcel of Sheep when they precipitately follow each other,

for no other Reaſon than that the Bell-Weather took the Leap before them: And yet the greater Part of our pretended Improvements in Literature are little elſe than a careleſs Repetition of what others have ſaid as careleſly before us.

SECT. IX. *Of the Number, Diverſity, and proper Uſe of Accents.*

To ſet this Affair of Accent in a true Light, it will be neceſſary to throw aſide entirely the Ideas uſually annexed to the Term by thoſe who have treated of the learned Languages, and to conſider it ſimply, as we experience its Effects in the Engliſh.

It is from a due Obſervance of theſe Effects, that I will venture to lay down the following Rules, the Truth of which (however contrary to common Opinion) I hope ſufficiently to illuſtrate by Examples.

1ſt. That *Accent*, in Engliſh, is neither the Tone of an articulate Voice, nor ſimply the Time taken up in the Utterance of it; nor merely the Force or Loud-

Loudneſs of ſuch Voice; but the whole Momentum or Quantity of Sound emitted to produce it.

2. That Syllables being accented as variouſly as the Meaſures of their Length and Force can be combined, and the Meaſures of Syllables being conſidered as *long*, *neutral* and *ſhort*, there are two capital Diſtinctions in the Mode of accenting Syllables, *viz.* the *loud* and the *ſoft*: The *former* belonging to *ſhort* Syllables, the *latter* to *long* ones.

3. That Words of more than one Syllable are not confined to a ſingle Accent; nor Words of any Number of Syllables to a *ruling* one; even thoſe of two Syllables having frequently *two equal* Accents; the one *loud* and ſhort, the other *ſoft* and long.

4. That hence Syllables may be *equally* accented, though one of them be pronounced *ſoftly*, and the other *loud*, provided the former be proportionably longer in Utterance than the latter.

5. That the Accent placed on Diſſyllables is always greateſt; and that it grows weaker in Proportion as the Number of accented Syllables in a Word encreaſe.

6. That the Accent is not of general Uſe in connecting Syllables into Words, however uſeful it may be in dividing Words into Syllables.

With regard to the firſt of theſe Propoſitions, I preſume it is ſufficiently proved by what hath already been advanced in the preceding Sections.

As to the *ſecond*, it is but a Corollary of the firſt; for the Momenta of two Voices may be *equal*, though different in Length or Loudneſs, as Voices may have *different* Momenta, though equal in either Length or Loudneſs; articulate Sounds equally loud, not being equally accented, unleſs equally long. Hence ariſes that Duplicity in the Mode of accenting long and ſhort Syllables; ſo that there is no Neceſſity, as Mr. Sheridan ſuppoſes, either for uttering polyſyllable Words in ſo uniform a Manner as to reſemble a regular Succeſſion of Monoſyllables, nor of huddling three or four indiſtinctly together, in order to lay a great Streſs merely upon one.

I confeſs that two Syllables, the one immediately following the other, and both accented equally and *exactly alike*, would very

very much reſemble two Words. It is frequently neceſſary, however, that compound Words ſhould be ſo pronounced; and yet the natural Pauſe we always make between ſeparate Words, both in Speaking and Reading, is ſufficient to mark the Difference between diſtinct Words and ſuch Syllables. Thus *ſhipwreck*, *whirlwind*, &c. are eaſily diſtinguiſhed as ſingle Words; and yet, if pronounced according to Mr. Sheridan's Rule of allowing but one Accent to a Word, not only the Meaning of the Words would be obſcured, but the Ear offended, by the falſe Pronunciation: For it is certain that the Syllables *wreck* and *wind*, are as ſignificant, and alſo naturally as long, as *ſhip* and *whirl*; and yet we frequently hear the Accent laid, in common Converſation, on the firſt Syllables only, while the latter are hurried indiſtinctly off the Tongue, as if they were totally inſignificant.

Again, there are many Words of two Syllables, on both of which an equal Accent ought to be laid, if we take in their naturally Difference of Time, *e. g. compound*, *convoy*, *colleague*, *conſort*, *concourſe*,

exile, empire, inſtinct, linguiſt, and many others.

Mr. Sheridan takes upon him to cenſure moſt of our public Speakers, and particularly thoſe of the Stage, for pronouncing Words of this Kind with two equal Accents. It is not eaſy, however, to know what HE means by the Equality of Accent; his Notion of Accent itſelf being ſo confuſed and indiſtinct. Thus, according to him, it conſiſts ſometimes merely in the *Length*, or what he calls the Quantity, of a Syllable, and at others in the Streſs laid on the Voice in Articulation.

For my Part, I conceive, as before obſerved, that the Accent is compounded of both the Length and the Streſs of the Voice, and that Syllables may be accented equally, though in a different Manner: In which Caſe, two equal Accents may ſucceed each other, without any Impropriety of Sound, if diverſified in their Modes of *loud* and *ſoft*. Thus in the Words *cólleàgue, concòurſe, éxile, fútile*, &c. let us place the *ſharp* or *loud* Accent, marked thus ', on the firſt Syllable, and the *flat* or *ſoft* Accent, marked thus `, on

the

the laſt Syllable, and the Method of pronouncing them will be properly indicated: Whereas,

If the laſt Syllable be left unaccented, and therefore be ſhortened in the Pronunciation into *cóllĕg*, *cóncŭrs*, *éxĭl*, *fútĭl*, we ſhould deſtroy all Beauty and Propriety of Articulation, the firſt Property of Speech *.

The Method of Pronunciation here recommended, is, indeed, objected to by ſome, as pedantic and formal, and therefore they teach Perſons to pronounce all Words juſt as they are hurried over in common Converſation. There is a very wide Difference, however, between Formality and Slovenlineſs; between a ſtarched and

* As by ſo doing, we ſhould fall into the Vice of what Mr. Sheridan calls the *Cockney* Pronunciation, and for which he ſo ſeverely cenſures the London Citizens, whom he charges with pronouncing the Words *bellow*, *hollow*, *follow*, *window*, &c. thus *béllĕr*, *hóllĕr*, *fóllĕr*, *wíndĕr*; but if we ſtrenuouſly inſiſt on having but one excluſive Accent in a Word, I don't know how thoſe Words can be pronounced otherwiſe; their true Pronunciation being *béllò*, *hóllò*, *fóllo*, *wíndò*. With what Propriety Mr. Sheridan can blame the *Cockneys* for ſaying *béllĕr* and *fóllĕr*, and cenſure the *Players* equally for not ſaying *fórtŭn*, *nátŭr*, *báttlĕmĕnt*, inſtead of *fórtùne*, *nátùre*, *báttlĕmènt*, I leave the Reader to judge.

pedantic Mode of Pronunciation, which affects to give every Syllable and Letter indiſcriminately its full Sound, and that diſtinct and emphatical Mode which gives to articulate Voices their due Proportion of Sound, agreeable to their Significance and natural Conſtruction. It is farther to be obſerved, that the colloquial Abbreviations and Contractions, which are by ſome made of ſo much Conſequence, are very eaſily attained by thoſe who are once Maſters of the juſt or rhetorical Mode of Speaking: Whereas, ſuch as are only verſed in the colloquial Methods of Pronunciation, are ſtrangely at a Loſs when they come to read aloud, or to ſpeak in public.

The Difference between the *colloquial* and the ſolemn Modes of Pronunciation, is much greater in ſome other Languages than our own. In reading French Poetry, it is the Cuſtom to pronounce every Word and Syllable extremely diſtinct; ſo that an illiterate Pariſian, or one who could not read, and therefore knew only the common colloquial Pronunciation of the French Tongue, could not poſſibly underſtand any Thing of what was ſo read.

The

The fourth Propoſition is ſufficiently illuſtrated by the Remarks already made.

In regard to the fifth, *viz.* "That the "Accent placed on Diſſyllables is always "greateſt, and that it grows weaker in "Proportion as the Number of Syllables "in a Word increaſe;"

It will be neceſſary to obſerve, that *Accent*, properly ſpeaking, and conſidered as diſtinct from *Emphaſis*, hath nothing to do with *Monoſyllables*. Mr. Sheridan, indeed, ſays, that all the Monoſyllables, which can properly be called Words, are accented. He admits, however, that they obtain their Accent, and become Words, only by being *emphatical*. But unleſs they conſtitute, or form Part of a Sentence, they cannot be *emphatical*: Whereas Polyſyllables, or Words of more than one Syllable, bear an Accent whether they form a Part of a Sentence or no; *i. e.* whether they have any Emphaſis or not. Beſides, Mr. Sheridan, in diſtinguiſhing *Accent* from *Emphaſis*, defines the former as "the Link which ties Syllables together, "and forms them into Words." A Definition that certainly confines mere *Accent* to Words of more than one Syllable.

Admit-

Admitting, however, that, with regard to Monoſyllables, Accent and Emphaſis are the ſame Thing, the Rule will ſtill hold, and the Streſs laid on the accented Words of one Syllable is the greateſt; on thoſe of two Syllables the next; and ſo on to Polyſyllables of any Number.

By the way it is to be obſerved, that when I ſay the Streſs will be the *greateſt*, I mean, that accented Syllables in Words of the feweſt Syllables will be ſounded ſo much louder or longer in Proportion to the unaccented Syllables in the ſame Words. Thus in *anger*, *beaver*, *booty*, *cully*, *darkly*, *dwindle*, &c. the Difference between the accented and unaccented Syllables is greater than in the Words *ambuſcade*, *appertain*, *cavalcade*, *intercept*, *entertain*, *repartee*, &c. The like Difference is ſtill leſs in the laſt Words than in the following, *aſſaſſinate*, *commemorate*, *contaminate*, *exemplify*, *impertinent*, &c. And again ſtill leſs in theſe than in the following, *aſſeveration*, *ariſtocratical*, *commemoration*, *excommunication*, *diſcontinuation*, *eccleſiaſtical*, *recapitulation*, *tranſubſtantiation*, &c. It is evidently impoſſible to pronounce any of the latter Words tolerably diſtinct, with-

without laying almoſt as much Streſs on the unaccented Syllables, as on thoſe which are accented. It muſt be alſo quite unneceſſary to inſiſt farther on the Abſurdity of thinking to link ſuch a Number of Syllables intelligibly together by one leading Accent; for when the Difference between the accented and unaccented Syllables is ſo little, that, between the ruling Accent and the inferior ones, muſt be altogether inadequate to the Purpoſes intended.

And yet Lord Kaims is of the ſame Opinion in this reſpect with Mr. Sheridan; laying it down as a general Obſervation, that a Word of *whatever Number* of Syllables, is not accented upon more than one of them. "Nor is this Practice, ſays his Lordſhip, merely arbitrary: The Object repreſented by the Word, being ſet in its beſt Light by a ſingle Accent: Reiterated Accents on different Syllables in Succeſſion make not the Emphaſis ſtronger, but have an Air, as if the Sound only of the accented Syllables were regarded, and not the Senſe of the Word."

For my Part, I do not underſtand what this ingenious Critic means by giving a

Word

Word *an Air, as if,* &c. but this is very certain, that if the longer Polyſyllables above-mentioned were pronounced with only one Accent, the *Senſe of the Word* would be totally diſregarded, as the Accent, when they are hurried over in common Diſcourſe, is always laid on the moſt inſignificant Syllable in the whole Word: Thus in *excommunication, diſcontinuation, reconciliation,* &c. the Accent, if ſingle, would be laid on the *ca* and *a*; in *immutability, infallibility,* &c. on the *il*; and in *circumlocution, circumvolution,* &c. on the *cu* and *lu*.

Is it poſſible that by ſuch a Method of Accentuation, the Object of Words can be ſet in the beſt Light, or the Senſe of them be moſt regarded?

If it be ridiculous, as his Lordſhip obſerves, "to put an Emphaſis on a Word "that of itſelf has no Meaning, and, "like Cement, ſerves only to unite Words "ſignificant," the ſame Rule is equally applicable to the Syllables forming Words, ſome of which are ſignificant, and others in a great Degree merely formal.

With regard to the *ſixth* Propoſition, concerning the pretended Uſe of Accent

in

in linking the Syllables of Words together: Nothing can be more chimerical, nor has it the leaſt Foundation in Practice, except in the Pronunciation of ſuch Polyſyllables, as may, without any great Impropriety, be accented differently, *i. e.* with either a *flat* or a *ſharp* Accent.

" If I pronounce the Word *ar-ti-cu-la-*
" *tion*, ſays Mr. Sheridan, as it is thus
" divided into Syllables, without diſtin-
" guiſhing any Syllable from the reſt, it
" is no longer a Word, but a Succeſſion
" of Syllables; but when I pronounce it
" *articulátion*, laying an Accent on the
" Syllable *lá*, that it is which conſtitutes
" a Word, by uniting the preceding Syl-
" lables, and the ſubſequent one, to it-
" ſelf."

This Matter appears, however, in a very different and a very extraordinary Light to me, who cannot conceive that the Streſs laid on a formal and unmeaning Part of a Word, ſhould conſtitute the *Eſſence* of it.

It is, indeed, far from being true that it does ſo, it being impoſſible to pronounce this Word *articulation* INTELLIGIBLY, without laying an Emphaſis on the

the firſt or ſecond Syllable, and that as great a one (tho' not of the ſame Kind†) as that which is uſually laid on the fourth. Add to this, that if we divide the Word agreeable to our Pronunciation of it, the articulate Voices, of which it conſiſts, are different from the Syllables into which Mr. Sheridan hath divided it. Thus, ſuppoſing the Accent laid on the firſt Syllable, we ſhould ſay *ar't-i-cu-là-tion*; if on the ſecond, *ar-tic-u-là-tion*; but we never ſay, *ar-ti-cu-la-tion:* For, in order to render any derivative Word (as Polyſyllables moſtly are) intelligible, it is abſolutely neceſſary to lay one Accent on ſome Part of the radical Term: Whereas, if there be but one Accent laid on the whole, and that on the Syllable *là*, the radical Word *article* would be entirely ſunk in the Pronunciation.

That, in the Caſe of a ſingle Accent, it is neceſſary to huddle the other Syllables indiſtinctly together, to lay the Streſs on that ſingle Syllable, is very certain; and ſo far the unaccented Syllables of a Word may be ſaid to be joined together by the

† The former being a quick or ſharp one, and the other a ſlow or flat one.

Accent;

Accent; but inſtead of being *linked* together, they are compreſſed or forced one upon another; for the Accent on *la* is ſo far from uniting the preceding Syllables of of the Word to thoſe which follow it, that it abſolutely divides them.

In like Manner in the Words *ac'ciden'tal, con'trover'ſial, málefac'tor, cir'cumſcrìbing, dómineèring*, &c. there is no Way in the World to diſtinguiſh them ſeverally from two diſtinct Words in Pronunciation, except by the Difference of Pauſe in the Middle, and at the End of ſuch Words.

This pretended linking Quality in the Accent, may ſeem to take place in ſuch compound Words as *orthógraphy, geógraphy*, &c. but this is an adventitious Effect of the Seat of the Accent, which is owing to orthographical Motives, which are foreign to the preſent Purpoſe.

Were we to divide our Word into Syllables, agreeable to the Rules of Orthoëpy, inſtead of Orthography, the Accent might aſſiſt us in ſuch Diviſion. And, indeed, if we conſider only the Pronunciation of Words, *i. e.* as they are compounded of diſtinct articulate Voices, nothing can be more abſurd than the inconſiſtent Method

of

of the Grammarians, in dividing Words into Syllables one way, and directing their Pronunciation, as Compounds of particular Voices, in another. Thus we are taught to *pronounce* the following Words, as in the *firſt* Column, and to divide them into Syllables, in Spelling, as in the *ſecond*.

1ſt. *As pronounced.*	2d. *As ſpelt.*
Am-i-ty	A-mi-ty
ded-i-cate	de-di-cate
em-i-nent	e-mi-nent
hom-i-cide	ho-mi-cide
nav-i-gate	na-vi-gate
neg-a-tive	ne-ga-tive
mat-ri-mon-y	ma-tri-mo-ny
or-thog-ra-phy	or-tho-gra-phy
rec-om-pence	re-com-pence
an-a-gram	a-na-gram
ap-oſ-tro-phe	a-po-ſtro-phe
ap-oth-e-ca-ry	a-po-the-ca-ry
an-im-oſ-i-ty	a-ni-mo-ſi-ty
ar-iſ-toc-ra-cy	a-ri-ſto-cra-cy
ge-om-e-try	ge-o-me-try
mad-ri-gal	ma-dri-gal
mag-a-zine	ma-ga-zine
om-i-nous	o-mi-nous

Now

Now I will leave it to the Judgment of the Reader to determine whether a Foreigner, or any other, who might only know the Sound of the Letters, would not ſooner learn to pronounce the above Words, by ſeeing them divided into articulate Voices, according to their real Pronunciation, than by puzzling himſelf with the numerous and very exceptionable Rules that have been invented to reconcile this falſe Method of dividing Words to their Pronunciation, by Means of Accent.

If Syllables be articulate Voices, as Grammarians define them, why are not Words divided into Syllables, agreeable to their real Articulation * ?

It

* If the Grammarians have other Reaſons for thus dividing Words, they ſhould not have given ſuch a Definition of a Syllable; for if a Syllable be, as they ſay, thoſe compleat and diſtinct *Sounds* which unite in the Formation of Words, almoſt all the Rules they lay down for dividing Words into Syllables, are falſe. Thus they ſay, "when a ſingle Conſonant comes between two Vowels, "it goes with the *laſt* Vowel in dividing a Word into "Syllables." Is this true, however, in *ag'ony*, *al'iment*, *am'ity*, *cap'ital*, *drag'on*, *el'ement*, *ep'icure*, *fin'ical*, *hab'it*, *hon'eſt*, *mod'el*, and a Thouſand others of the like Nature? And yet Grammarians uſually only except the

It is the making this abſurd Diſtinction between written Syllables and articulate Sounds, that hath cauſed ſuch intolerable Confuſion in Writing and Speaking Engliſh.

I preſume it ſufficiently clear, therefore, from what hath been advanced, that Mr. Sheridan's Scheme for removing this Confuſion, by Means of Accents, is rather calculated to increaſe it †. It is this

Letter *x* from this Rule, tho' the ſofteſt Conſonant in the Alphabet is as exempt from it as the hardeſt. Thus *c* in *tacit*, and *ſ* in *viſit*, are as firmly attached to the preceding Vowel, as the *x* in *exalt*, *exiſt*, &c.

† Lord Kaims and Mr. Sheridan conceive, that the juſt Pronunciation of written Language cannot be eaſily pointed out to the Reader, without a Diverſity of Typographical Marks; whereas I ſhall endeavour, in the proper Place, to ſhew, that, with the Help of a few general Rules for Pronunciation, and the ſimple Uſe of the Marks ſerving to point out the *grave* and *acute* Sounds among the Ancients, the juſt Pronunciation of all the Words in our Language may be known at Sight. With regard to the Effects of *Emphaſis*, indeed, this is another Matter, reſpecting the Pronunciation of whole Sentences, and depending entirely on the Senſe and Meaning of the Writer. So that, in ſhort and eaſily intelligible Sentences, no Marks of any Kind would be neceſſary to point out the emphatical Words, which would be obvious at firſt Sight. And in more nice and difficult Paſſages, thoſe Words might be rendered ſo, by printing them in different Types; for which

this Conſideration which firſt induced me to think of compoſing a RHETORICAL GRAMMAR of the *Engliſh Language*, on a very different Plan, in which I doubt not of reconciling the Orthography and Orthoëpy of our Tongue in a more ſatisfactory Manner than hath hitherto been attempted *.

SECT. X. *Of the Power and Uſe of Accent in the Quantity of Verſe.*

Having conſidered the Nature of articulate Sounds and Syllables in general, we come next to conſider them as they enter

which End thoſe in Uſe, the *Roman*, *Italic*, and *Capital* ſmall and great, are fully ſufficient. In Confirmation of this, the Reader may turn to the new Edition of *Milton's Paradiſe Loſt*, publiſhed for the Uſe of Schools; where he will find the emphatical Words thus diſtinguiſhed. In that Work would have been introduced alſo, the Author's Method of *Accentuation*, had he not been fearful it would have been too great a Deviation from the common Plan of Printing, to be well received, without ſome previous Obſervations on its Expediency and Uſe; both which will be further illuſtrated and explained at large in a future Work.

* This Work is in great Forwardneſs, and will be publiſhed with all convenient Speed.

into the Compoſition of proſodiacal Quantity.

Moſt Writers, on the Proſody of our Language, have deduced their Rules from the Latin and Greek. It muſt appear ſomething ludicrous, however, if not ridiculous, to People diveſted of claſſical Prejudices, to think that the Proſody of a living Language ſhould be formed upon that of a dead one.

With regard to a living Language, a Man hath nothing to do but to liſten with Attention, to be able, in a very ſhort Time, to judge, with tolerable Accuracy, of the Length of ſimple Sounds. But with regard to a dead Language, it is ſurely impoſſible for any one to judge exactly of the Quantity of thoſe Syllables, concerning whoſe Articulation almoſt every Nation differ both in Opinion and Practice.

Suppoſing, however, that the Mechaniſm of the ancient Verſification ſhould ſufficiently determine the Quantity of the Syllables of ancient Languages; yet I ſhould be glad to know what Influence ſuch Quantity muſt neceſſarily have over the Syllables of modern Tongues. Is it

that,

that, being ſpelt in the ſame Manner, they muſt be pronounced in the ſame Manner? It hath been already obſerved, that the ſame Letters have not the ſame Sound, even among contemporary Languages: How then are we to judge of the Force of thoſe made Uſe of many Ages ago?

In Words, indeed, immediately derived from the Latin or Greek, there is all the Reaſon in the World for preſerving the particular Quantity of the Syllables, unleſs ſuch a Mode ſhould contradict any general Rule or eſtabliſhed Mode of Pronunciation in our own Tongue: In which Caſe, the Propriety of abiding by a general Rule, ought to ſuperſede the Conſiderations of the Etymology or Orthoëpy of a particular Word; and that, becauſe no Word is properly naturalized, if the Mode of pronouncing it differ from the common Practice of pronouncing other Engliſh Words ſo ſpelt; ſuch Words, however frequently made Uſe of, being in Fact ſtill foreign.

But whatever may have been the Rules by which the Writers on Engliſh Proſody have determined the *Quantity* of Syllables,

the following Remarks may ſerve to ſhew they are precarious and defective.

In the firſt place, the Mode of eſtimating the Length of Syllables in Engliſh hath been hitherto abſurd. It is a very proper, as it is the only Way of judging of the Quantity of a Syllable in a dead Language, to deduce it from the Part it bears in the Metre of the Poets. But the Harmony of Engliſh Numbers doth not depend altogether on the Times of its metrical Feet; ſo it is abſurd to think of deducing the Length of the particular Syllables compoſing them, from the Place they occupy in the Verſe.

Mr. Say, in his Treatiſe on the Harmony and Variety of Numbers; and after him, Mr. Maſon, on the ſame Subject, tell us, that *Cuſtom* and *Accent* make thoſe Syllables ſhort which are naturally long, or contract a double Time into a ſingle one.

Again, we are told by the latter, that "though a Syllable be naturally ſhort, "yet if it be accented in the ordinary "Way of Pronunciation, or the Senſe "requires it to be read with an Empha-"ſis, it becomes a long Quantity."

To

To theſe, I may add the Authority of Mr. Samuel Johnſon, who, in the Grammar prefixed to his Dictionary, tells us, that *Accent* and *Quantity*, in Engliſh Verſification, is the ſame. For my part, however, I conceive that the ſureſt and moſt ſimple Way of judging of the Length of Syllables in a living Language, is to appeal to the Ear, and to the Time taken up in their Pronunciation.

It is very certain, that their natural Length is increaſed or diminiſhed when they are connected together in a Sentence, as the Senſe may require the Voice to dwell on, or to haſten over ſuch Syllables, *i. e.* as they are ſignificant or inſignificant. Indeed, the Length of the whole Clauſe or Sentence ſhould, in the ſame Manner, be adapted to its Importance in the whole Diſcourſe. It is to be obſerved, nevertheleſs, that Emphaſis doth not conſiſt in lengthening the Syllable, as theſe Writers intimate, any more than in raiſing its Tone, according to others; but in giving it *Force*, or pronouncing it *full* and *loud*.

It is true that, to pronounce a Syllable as *full* and *loud* as poſſible, we muſt give it its whole natural Length; but if this be

exceeded, the Conſequence is not emphatical, but a feeble Drawl. On the other hand, as to Syllables naturally ſhort, no *Accent* or Emphaſis can poſſibly make them long: For Inſtance, the Syllables *wĕl*, *răp*, *ſŏp*, what Emphaſis can convert them into *weel*, *rape*, *ſope*? Again, what Force of Accent or Emphaſis can give the Monoſyllables *and*, *hand*, *ſtand*, the ſame Length as the laſt Syllable in *command*?

The Length of the unaccented ſhort Syllables in a Verſe, depends entirely on the Time allotted for the longeſt emphatical Word in the Verſe or Sentence; the Length and Loudneſs of every other Word in that Sentence being greater or leſs in Proportion to the Degree of Significance and Importance, which it bears in Relation to ſuch principal Word or Words.

Hence it is that, if neutral Words be made *ſhort* in any Diſcourſe, they are not made poſitively ſo, or reduced exactly to half the Time of long Syllables, but may be of various Lengths, agreeable to their Importance. Now, though it is in the Power of Accent and Emphaſis, by enforcing one Syllable, and thereby giving it its natural Length, to render others

compa-

comparatively ſhorter; it doth not, as I before obſerved, make ſhort ones long, and long ſhort, or even neutral ones, either poſitively or *indefinitely*.

The Emphaſis and Duration of the longeſt and loudeſt Syllables in a Verſe, are certainly poſitive; for if either be carried to exceſs, *Speaking* degenerates into *Drawling* or *Roaring*. But the Duration of the ſhorter Syllables is purely relative, that of the ſhorteſt being indefinite, and limited only by the Audibility of the Sentence.

If the ſame Sentences were ſpoken at one Time with Deliberation, and at another with Impetuoſity, it is certain the Length of the Syllables would be different; but the Length of any one Syllable would ſtill bear the ſame Proportion to that of any other in the ſame Sentence, if ſpoken with equal Propriety.

Hence it appears, that the Beauty and Harmony of Engliſh Numbers do not depend on the ſole Diſpoſition of long and ſhort Syllables: *Quantity*, with us, not conſiſting merely of *Tone* or of *Tune*, as it is ſuppoſed to have done among the Ancients: For it is very certain, that *Accent*

ſupplies

ſupplies the Place of Time in Engliſh Verſe; that is, a ſhort accented Syllable hath the ſame Force, and ſupplies the ſame Place in a Foot as a long accented one. It doth not hence follow, however, that the natural Length or *Time* of Syllables ſhould be neglected, or conſidered as altogether the ſame Thing as Emphaſis or Accent.

It is certainly a very commodious Way, which ſome Writers have hit upon, of getting rid of the Difficulty of aſcertaining the Length of Syllables, by ſubjecting Time to Accent, and making ſuch Syllables either ſhort or long, juſt as they happen to ſtand in the Verſe. We ſhould read, however, with as little Propriety, by attending *ſolely* to the Streſs of Accent and Emphaſis (important as they confeſſedly are) as we ſhould in entirely neglecting them for mere Time.

It would be attended alſo with equal Impropriety, if no other Diſtinction were made between long and ſhort Syllables, than the uſual Method of ſuppoſing one juſt twice as long as the other. The Abſurdities into which the Advocates for this Syſtem fall, are, indeed, truly ridiculous.

Maſon,

Maſon, after making the above Diſtinction, and imputing to a ſhort Syllable what he calls a *ſingle Time*, confeſſes, that "there is a Difference in the ſingle "Times, ſome being in Reality, and in "Length of Pronunciation, *more* than "*two* of the ſingle or ſhort ones." And yet he ſuppoſes it in the Power of the Accent or Emphaſis to prolong a ſhort Syllable even to *three Times* its natural Length.

The ſame Thing, indeed, he ſays, is obſervable in the *Latin* Quantities, and was remarked by Quinctilian. *Et longis longiores, et brevibus ſunt breviores Syllabæ**. But what doth this prove, except that the Emphaſis, or natural Mode of Pronunciation, might poſſibly, among the Latins (as it doth with us) compenſate for the various Length of Syllables in the Compoſition of Verſe. This at leaſt is certain, that it doth, by no means, prove the Propriety of the ſimple Diſtinction of Syllables merely into *long* and *ſhort*.

If Syllables are *long* and *ſhort*, there are undoubtedly *ſome* that are *neither*; it being

* Quinctilian, Lib. ix. Chap. 4.

im-

impoſſible, in ſuch a Diverſity, to paſs from one poſitive Quality to another which is quite oppoſite, without encountering ſome in the Midway. It might, in Fact, be as well aſſerted, that there are no diſtinct Sounds between any given Note and its Octave, as to pretend there are not Syllables of different Lengths between a *Breve* of one Time, and a *Longum* of two Times.

The Cenſure of Iſaac Voſſius may poſſibly not be altogether juſt; but it muſt be allowed, that the common Notions with regard to the Difference of the Syllables, hath given great Room for his aſſerting, " That there is nothing but " Confuſion of Quantities in the modern " Odes.—That the Moderns have no re- " gard to the natural Quantity of Sylla- " bles; and have introduced an unnatural " and barbarous Variety of long and ſhort " Notes, without any regard to the Sub- " ject and Senſe of the Verſe, or the na- " tural Pronunciation."

To invalidate this Objection, it is ſaid, among other Things, that, notwithſtanding Accent and Quantity were two different Things among the Ancients, " it is " impoſſible any ſuch Diſtinction between

" the

" the Accents and Quantities can be ob-
" ſerved in reading Engliſh, as one may
" preſently be convinced, by making the
" Experiment *."

Now, I am fully perſuaded that the Experiment would determine the contrary, and that there cannot be a more vicious Cuſtom in Reading than that of neglecting the natural Length of the Syllables, and confining the Rythmus or Metre of Engliſh Verſe to a certain Number of Syllables, pronounced long or ſhort, juſt as their Poſition in the Verſe, or the Emphaſis of the Sentence may require.

Mr. Maſon, in order to juſtify the abovementioned Aſſertion, gives an Inſtance, wherein a double Time, as he calls it, is contracted into a ſingle one. And, indeed, Mr. Say, and others, tell us of a *cuſtomary* Method of contracting two ſhort Syllables into one. The Cuſtom, however, muſt be extremely vicious, and tend to great Confuſion in Pronunciation.

The Example brought by Maſon is the following Line.

Th' ĭnfērnăl Sērpĕnt; Hē ĭt wās whŏſe Gūile.

* Maſon on the Power of Numbers, Pages 10 and 11.

Here,

Here, continues this Author, the Syllables *in*, *nal*, *pent*, *whoſe*, which are naturally long, are all ſhort by Accent. Now, I cannot poſſibly find out how theſe Syllables can naturally be equally long, or even nearly ſo; nor can I diſcover why the Syllable *in* (which if I did not call a ſhort one, I ſhould denominate a *neutral*. i. e. neither long nor ſhort) ſhould, by Poſition, be here rendered ſhort, eſpecially when it is joined to the ſhort Syllable *the*. *Two ſhort* Syllables may be well enough blended into a *long* one, but to have a *long* and a *ſhort* both contracted into a *ſhort* one, is rather going too far. It is the more needleſs alſo, as the Verſe might be almoſt as well read without it. Again, as to the Word WHOSE, there is not the leaſt Pretence for its being accounted or pronounced ſhort in this Place, except what is deduced from the arbitrary and mechanical Rule, laid down by ſome for the Structure of an heroic Verſe.

Mr. Johniſon defines *Verſification* to be the Arrangement of a *certain Number* of *Syllables*, according to certain Laws. This certain Number of Syllables in heroic and tragic Poetry, he declares to be

ten;

ten; in the Arrangement of which, he ſays, the Accents are to be placed on the even Syllables, every Line, conſidered by itſelf, being more harmonious as this Rule is more ſtrictly obſerved *.

Now, that heroic Verſes, thus formed, would be more *even* or *regular*, I grant; but I deny that they would be more *harmonious*, even conſidered ſeparately †. I ſhould be glad to know from what Principle of Nature it is, that the regular alternate Succeſſion of five ſhort and five long Syllables forms a more harmonious line than a different Succeſſion or Diſpoſition of ſuch Syllables.

That *Verſification* conſiſts of the Arrangement of Syllables, according to certain Laws, is very true; but the heroic Meaſure is not confined to a *certain Number* of Syllables; nor are the Laws of Arrangement neceſſarily ſuch as Mr. Johnſon hath aſſerted ‡.

* See Johnſon's Engliſh Grammar prefixed to his Dictionary, Fol. Ed.

† A ſufficient Proof of this will be given hereafter.

‡ This will be more fully demonſtrated in treating of the *Harmony* of Verſification.

As a Proof of this Aſſertion, I ſhall quote ſome few convincing Lines, to ſhew that an heroic Verſe is not confined to a certain Number of Syllables, and, at the ſame Time, to give as full a Demonſtration, that, though the Accent doth ſometimes ſupply the Place of Time, in forming the Quantity, yet that it cannot always do ſo to the Excluſion of Time, without deſtroying the Propriety, Beauty, and, I will add, *Harmony* of the Numbers.

There are no leſs, for Inſtance, than fourteen Syllables in the firſt, and twelve in the laſt of the following Verſes.

And many an amorous, many a humorous Lay,
Which many a Bard had chanted many a Day.

And yet, there is not one that can be ſpared in the harmonious Repetition of thoſe Lines. The vicious Cuſtom of contracting our Syllables, in order to reduce them to the Standard of five accented and five unaccented, would make us read theſe Verſes in the Manner following.

And man' an am'r'us, man' a hum'r'us Lay,
Which man' a Bard had chanted man' a Day.

But could any Thing be more barbarous than ſuch Contractions, and Neglect of the

the natural Length of the Syllables compoſing theſe Verſes?

Again, we have a ſimilar Example in the following Verſe:

The wounded Bull
Roar'd bellowing, whilſt rebellowing rang the Woods.

If Accent may always ſupply the Place of *Time*, and the Harmony of the Verſe depends on a ſtrict Adherence to the above Rules concerning Accent, which makes Syllables long or ſhort by arbitrary Poſition, we muſt neceſſarily read the Verſe thus,

The wounded Bull
Roăr'd bĕll'wĭng, whĭlſt rĕbĕll'wĭng rāng thĕ Wōods.

On the other hand, if the Harmony of Verſe principally conſiſts, as I conceive it does, in the Conſonance or Affinity which the Words of ſuch Verſe bear to their Meaning, or in their Propriety or Aptitude to expreſs that Meaning, we ſhould certainly find it in giving every Syllable of this Verſe its full Sound and natural Length thus,

The wounded Bull
Roàr'd béllō-wing, whīlſt rèbéllō-wing ràng the Woods.

The diſcerning Reader will not only infer, from theſe Examples, the Neceſſity of making a Diſtinction between *Accent*

and mere *Time*; but alſo the like Neceſſity of conſidering *Quantity* in Engliſh Verſe as compounded of both; the one being no more to be neglected in Reading with Propriety than the other.

Sect. XI. *Of Engliſh Numbers, or metrical Feet.*

It was obſerved, in the ſecond Section, that Men could neither ſpeak, nor be underſtood, by a regular Succeſſion of uniform and unvaried Sounds; and, that hence the Voice would neceſſarily fall into a certain Kind of Modulation, both in Speaking and Reading.

This Modulation, it is preſumed, firſt gave riſe to the Invention of metrical Feet, or Numbers, which, being diſpoſed in a certain Order, are denominated Verſes. Of theſe Verſes, again, there are various Kinds, according to the different Species of Feet made Uſe of, or the particular Modes of Diſpoſition.

From obſerving the agreeable Effect of Numbers in poetical Compoſitions, the Orators adopted them in their proſaic Declamations; hence forming, what

is uſually called, a *numerous* or flowing Stile.

Many, indeed, and ſurpriſing are the Stories recorded of the Effects of this Attention to numerous Compoſition, among the ancient Orators of Greece and Rome.

If it be true, however, (as ſome of the Learned aſſert) that the Ancients read by the Quantity * only, it is certain, that neither their Modes of Reading, nor of forming Syllables into metrical Feet, are at all applicable to the Engliſh Language.

This Point, it is true, hath been greatly laboured by ſome Writers, who have endeavoured to trace out the ancient Rythmus and Quantities in Engliſh Verſe. But they have, in theſe Attempts, diſplayed a much greater Share of Learning than Ingenuity, as will appear from the ſlighteſt Review of thoſe unſucceſsful Attempts. Dr. Pemberton, Mr. Maſon, and almoſt all others who have written on this Subject, admit, that Accent and Emphaſis (which they ſay is an *Elevation* of the Voice) ſupply the Place of *Time* on every Word or Syllable on which they fall. The

* Meaning the *Time*, or the Length of the Syllables.

former ſays, that "*the Emphaſis implies* "*greater Length in the Syllable* †:" And the latter, that the Syllables, when accented, are *conſidered as long* *. It is certain, however, as hath been already ſhewn, that there are Syllables which cannot be prolonged in the Pronunciation, notwithſtanding the ſtrongeſt Emphaſis. It is clear then, that Accent and Emphaſis do not actually give Time, but ſupply the Want of it in the Compoſition of metrical Feet. Nothing can be more abſurd, therefore, than to perſiſt in reducing Engliſh Numbers to the Dactyls, Spondees, &c. of the Ancients.

If, as Mr. Maſon repeatedly affirms, the proper Accent and Emphaſis is the chief Rule that determines the Engliſh Quantities; why are not the Value of theſe Accents determined, and the Feet meaſured by them, inſtead of the Standard of *long* and *ſhort* Syllables, which is not applicable? The Humouriſt at Oxford, who formerly ſold ſtrong Beer by the Ell, was much ſuch another Kind of a Meeter.

† Pemb. Obſervations on Poetry, Page 125.

* On the Power of Numbers, Page 11.

The

The Reaſon, however, is evident why the Degrees of Emphaſis could not be eſtimated. This could not be done while it was held to conſiſt in a Riſing of the Voice; as by this Method thoſe Degrees would have formed a muſical Scale, and have at once betrayed the Abſurdity of confounding the Tone of the Voice with its Energy and Force *.

It is for Want of having fixed on a proper Criterion, by which to judge of the Quantity of Syllables, that the Writer laſt mentioned finds it ſo very difficult to account for the Diverſity of thoſe metrical Feet he affects to diſcover in our Engliſh Verſes. In his Endeavours to do this, indeed, he falls into the ſtrange Inconſi-

* It is not without Difficulty that Perſons can diveſt themſelves of this Prejudice reſpecting the Elevation and Cadence of the Voice, in Speaking and Reading; it not being eaſy for thoſe, who are unacquainted with Muſic, to diſtinguiſh between a *loud* Note and a *high* one. That I might not be miſtaken, however, myſelf in this Particular, I repeated, at different Times, ſeveral Paſſages from Milton and other Poets, in the Hearing of one of the greateſt Maſters in that Science; who, after paying the utmoſt Attention to the ſeveral articulate Sounds in each Sentence, declared them to be all of the ſame Tone.

ſtency of denying that Accent and Emphaſis have any Effect in raiſing the Voice at all. Thus, he tells us for Example, that "The Drum is an Inſtrument which, "in a wonderful Manner, ſhews the "Force and Power of poetic Numbers; "for though its Sound be only a Monotony, yet it exactly expreſſes all the "different Qualities of the ſeveral Feet. "And when we beat thoſe Numbers upon "it, only by varying the Movement into "*quicker* or *ſlower*, and making the Sound "*ſtronger* or *ſofter*, the Mind is affected "as much as it is by an Inſtrument that "runs all the Notes of a Gamut †."

Nothing can be more unexceptionable than what is advanced in the above Paſſage; and yet this very ſame Writer tells us, elſewhere, that "Emphaſis is raiſing "the Voice; Cadence is falling it; and, "when rightly managed, is very muſi-"cal *."

When he comes to explain the Mechaniſm of Verſe, however, and to enquire into the Compoſition of metrical Feet, we

† Eſſay on the Power of Numbers, Page 14.

* Eſſay on Elocution, Page 24.

ſee

ſee he is obliged to reject this Mode of Harmony entirely, even though he admits that Accent and Emphaſis principally determine the Quantities of Engliſh Numbers.

The Futility of attempting to determine Engliſh metrical Feet, after the Rules of the Ancients, will farther appear by what this Author advances on the Subject of proſaic Numbers, and the Manner of examining the Feet of which any Period is compoſed.

There is ſo great a Parade of Learning, and ſo little Regard to Propriety on his Obſervations on this Subject, that I cannot reſiſt the Temptation of quoting the two firſt, with his Introduction to them. "Concerning the Manner of reducing "proſaic Numbers, or examining the "Feet of which any Period is compoſed, "we are here (ſays he) to take Dionyſius "for our Guide, who hath ſhewn us, in "various Inſtances, how proſaic Num-"bers are to be reduced. To take one "out of many, let us ſee in what Man-"ner he examines the Numbers of that "celebrated Speech of Thucydides, which

" he affirms to be full of Grandeur and
" Dignity, and begins thus, Οἱ μὲν | πολ-
" λοὶ | τῶν ἐν|θαδ' ἤ|δη εἰ|ρηκόλων | ἔπαινος |
" σιτὸν πρὸσ|θέτα τω|νομα τὸν|λόγον τον|δε.
" Now that which gives ſuch an Air of
" Majeſty to this Sentence (ſays he) is, that
" each Member of it is compoſed of the
" moſt ſublime and generous Feet: For
" in the firſt Member, which ends with
" εἰρηκόλων, the three firſt Feet are *Spon-*
" *dees*, the fourth an *Anapæſt*, the fifth a
" *Spondee*, and the ſixth a *Cretic*. And
" in the ſecond Member of the Sentence,
" which begins with the Word ἔπαινος,
" the two firſt Feet are *Bacchics*, (which
" he calls *Hypobacchics*) the third a *Cretic*,
" and the two laſt Feet *Bacchics*; the
" whole concluding with an odd Syllable,
" which is common.

" Now here I would make the follow-
" ing Obſervations.

" (1.) That in reducing Proſe-Sen-
" tences into their original Numbers,
" there is no Neceſſity to confine our-
" ſelves to diſſyllable Feet only.

" For in reducing the firſt Member of
" this Sentence, Dionyſius uſes both the

" diſ-

" diſſyllable and triſſyllable Feet: But it
" is capable of being reduced into all diſ-
" ſyllable Numbers thus,—Ō῾ι μ̄ε̄ν̄ | π̄ο̄λ̄-
" λ̄ο̄ι | τ̄ω̄ν̄ ε̄ν̄|θ̆ᾰδ̆ε̆ | η̄δ̄η̄ | ε̄ι̯ρ̄η̄|κ̆ο῾ῐω̄ν̄· And
" according to this Method of Reduc-
" tion, you ſee there is but one feeble
" Foot among them, *viz.* the *Pyrrhic* in
" the fourth Place; and even this is not
" at all amiſs, as it is there ſituated; for
" the *Spondee* immediately following cor-
" rects its Rapidity, and gives it the
" agreeable Air of an *Anapæſt*.

" Therefore (2.) in examining the
" Numbers of a proſaic Period, it is uſu-
" ally the beſt Way to reduce them into
" Feet of three Syllables rather than thoſe
" of two.

" For this Reaſon; becauſe though
" there may be ſeveral weak and baſe
" diſſyllable Feet in it, yet as they ſtand
" in Conjunction with others of a better
" Quality, they are ſtrengthened and har-
" monized, and become very good Feet
" of three or four Syllables. Thus the
" *Pyrrhic* and the *Trochee*, though they
" are both weak and feeble Numbers of
" themſelves, yet, followed by a *Spondee*,

" they

" they gather Force, and the one has the " Air of an *Anapæſt*, and the other of a " *Cretic*, which are both good triſſylla- " ble Feet. And therefore Dionyſius, " you obſerve, reſolves the ſecond Mem- " ber of the Sentence into all *Triſſyllables*; " by which Diviſion they appear to be " all ſtrong and generous Numbers: " Whereas, were they to be divided all " into Diſſyllables thus — ἐπαι|νέσι | τὸν " προσ|θεν|τὰ | τῶ νο|μέω τὸν | λόγον | τονδ' ε, " — there would appear to be no leſs than " three *Trochees*, which of themſelves are " baſe and feeble Feet, and might tempt " us to think that the Numbers were not " good: But being all ſucceeded by a " long Syllable, they are exalted and con- " firmed, and aſſume the Grace and Force " of a *Cretic*, which is a good triſſyllable " Foot."

" After this Example (proceeds Mr. " Maſon) let us examine the Feet in the " Engliſh Tranſlation of the two firſt " Verſes of the Bible, and we ſhall pre- " ſently ſee how much the Grandeur " of the Stile is owing to the Strength " and Magnificence of the Numbers, in

" which

" which the Tranſlators are often very " happy.

" *In the Be|ginning | God creat|ed the* " *Heav'ns | and the Earth, | and the Earth* " *| was without | Form and void; | and* " *Darkneſs | was upon | the Face | of the* " *Deep.*

" Theſe three Sentences, thus reduced, " appear to be made up of all the moſt " generous Feet, *viz.* the *Spondee*, *Cretic*, " *Moloſſus*, *Bacchic*, *Iambic* and *Anapæſt*, " without one weak or faultering Foot " among them; unleſs it be the firſt, " which is a *Dactyl:* And that being " corrected by a long Syllable immedi- " ately ſucceeding, becomes a good ini- " tial Number."

A very little Reflection will ſerve to convince the diſcerning Reader of the Futility of the above Obſervations and Application. It is to be remarked, in the firſt Place, that, according to Mr. Maſon himſelf, even the Greek Paſſage he quotes from Thucydides, may be ſcanned different Ways; that is, it may be either

reduced

reduced into Feet that are *noble* and *generous*, or into thoſe which are *baſe* and *feeble*. But is it poſſible that the Dignity and Grandeur of this Paſſage, if *real*, ſhould depend on the Method of ſcanning it? Doth the Reduction of the Words into metrical Feet make any Alteration in the Words themſelves? Is not their Harmony and Succeſſion the ſame, whatever Way they are ſcanned, or whether they are ſcanned or not? A Perſon who doth not underſtand Greek, may well be tempted to think that Dignity and Grandeur in a great Degree chimerical, which is thus dependent on the Mechaniſm of Numbers.

Again, with regard to the Application of his Rules to the Tranſlation of the Bible, I will ſuppoſe the Verſes he hath cited divided in this Manner.

In the | Begin|ning God | creat|ed the | Heav'ns and | the Earth, | and the | Earth was | without | Form and | void; and | Darkneſs | was up|on the | Face of | the Deep.

In

In this Caſe, the Reader will ſee that the Paſſage will contain two Pyrrhics, and a Number of *Trochees*, all baſe and feeble Feet. It is yet evident, that the Words being unaltered, the real Dignity and Harmony of the Paſſage muſt be the ſame.

If, indeed, it be the Buſineſs of the Reader to make every Thing appear noble and great, whether it really be ſo or not, I grant that the Rule of Dionyſius, here adopted by Mr. Maſon, is a very good one; but if he is to repreſent Things exactly as he finds them, I do not ſee how any particular Method of ſcanning a Paſſage, can either add to, or deprive it, of its natural Beauties.

The like Error Mr. Maſon falls into, with regard to the Meaſures of Engliſh Verſe; ſome of thoſe which he calls *Iambic*, having nothing eſſential to diſtinguiſh them from the *Trochaic*. Thus he quotes the following Imitation of Adrian's Addreſs to his Soul, and the three firſt Stanzas of Mr. Pope's Univerſal Prayer, as Examples of the Iambic Verſe.

ADRIAN's

ADRIAN's Address.

Poor lit|tle, pret|ty, flut|tering Thing!
Muſt we | no lon|ger live | together,
And doſt | thou prune | thy trem|bling Wing,
To take | thy flight | thou know'ſt | not whither?
Thy hu|morous Vein, | thy pleas|ing Folly,
Lies all | neglec|ted, all | forgot;
And pen|ſive, wav|ering, me|lancholly,
Thou dread'ſt | and hop'ſt | thou know'ſt | not what.

POPE's Universal Prayer.

If I | am right, | O teach | my Heart,
Still in | the right | to ſtay;
If I | am wrong, | thy Grace | impart,
To find | that bet|ter Way.

Save me | alike | from fool|iſh Pride,
And im|pious Dis|content;
At ought | thy Wis|dom hath | deny'd,
Or ought | thy Good|neſs lent.

Teach me | to feel | ano|ther's Woe,
To hide | the Fault | I ſee:
That Mer|cy I | to o|thers ſhow,
That Mer|cy ſhow | to me.

It

It is certain that, by arbitrarily making *accented* Syllables *long*, and *unaccented* ones *ſhort*, the above Verſes are twiſted in the Scanning into a Kind of mixt Iambic; but if the Iambic Meaſure be, as it is generally defined, *quick*, *light*, and *ſprightly* †, and the Trochaic, on the other hand, *weak* and *languid*, I think it would be much more conſiſtent with the uſual Definition of theſe Meaſures, and with the Senſe of the Verſes, to ſcan them as Trochaics. This might be done with the Introduction of as few *Iambics*, *Spondees*, and *Dactyls*, as Mr. Maſon hath introduced Trochees, Spondees, Pyrrichs, Anapæſts, and Amphybracchys, eſpecially if we take the ſame Liberty of ſetting off a ſupernumerary Syllable, as Mr. Maſon hath done in ſcanning the following Verſes, which he calls *Trochaic*.

Bleſt with | Senſe, with | Temper | bleſt,
Wiſdom | o'er thy | Lips preſides;
Virtue | guards thy | gen'rous | Breaſt,
Kindneſs | all thy | Actions | guides.

† Horace calls the Iambic Foot *pes citus*. It is alſo generally defined by the Moderns as a bold rapid Movement.

Ev'ry

Ēv'ry | home-felt * | Bliſs is | mine,
Ēv'ry | fēmale | Grace is | thine;
Chaſte De|portment, | artleſs | Mein,
Cōnverſe | ſweet, and | Heart ſe|rene.

Now, as no Reaſon can be given why the ſupernumerary Syllable may not be ſet off at the Beginning, as well as at the End of the Line †, what, if we ſhould ſcan theſe Lines after the Manner of Iambics, would not both the Sound and Senſe be equally conſiſtent?

Bleſt | with Senſe, | with Tem|per bleſt,
Wis|dom o'er | thy Lips | preſides;
Vir|tue guards | thy gen'|rous Breaſt,
Kind|neſs all | thy Ac|tions guides.

* It is to be obſerved, that theſe Writers do not always abide by their own Rules. The Monoſyllable *I*, in the laſt Line but one, of the Verſes quoted from Pope's Univerſal Prayer, is made ſhort, though it be ſtrongly emphaſized. Again, the laſt Syllable of the compound Word *home-felt*, cannot poſſibly be ſhortened in this Line, without injuring the Senſe.

† Mr. Maſon taking off one, and ſometimes two Syllables, from the Beginning of the Verſes he calls Anapæſts. At the ſame Time he makes no Scruple of making long and even *emphatical* Syllables ſhort, in order to adopt the Words to his ſuppoſed Meaſures.

Ēv'ry

Ev'|ry home|felt Bliſs | is mine,
Ev'|ry fe|male Grace | is thine;
Chaſte | Deport|ment, art|leſs Mein,
Con|verſe ſweet, | and Heart | ſerene.

In like Manner, ſhould we ſcan the Verſes, before quoted as Iambics, converting them into Trochaics, thus,

Poor | little, | pretty, | fluttering | Thing!
Muſt | we no | longer | live to|gether,
And | doſt thou | prune thy | trembling | Wing,
To | take thy | flight thou | know'ſt not | whither?

I conceive that the Trochaic Meaſure, which, according to this Writer, is "*naturally ſoft, languid, and flowing*," would ſuit the Subject as well as, or better than, the Iambic. Be this, however, as it will, the Verſes are ſtill the ſame, ſcan them which Way you pleaſe, which ſhews how little applicable the ancient Meaſures are to Engliſh Poetry, and how much we are ſtill at a Loſs for a mechanical Criterion, by which to eſtimate the true Quantity of metrical Feet or Syllables.

This will appear ſtill more conſpicuous, on comparing ſome Engliſh Verſes, whoſe Effects and Harmony are totally different,

and yet would be ſcanned, after the Mode of the Ancients, exactly in the ſame Manner.

There is a Paſſage in *Milton's Paradiſe Regained,* wherein he introduces Satan, recommending to our Saviour, the Study of the Athenian Orators.

> Thoſe Ancient, whoſe reſiſtleſs Eloquence
> Wielded at Will that fierce Democratie,
> Shook th' Arſenal and fulmin'd over Greece,
> To Macedon, and Artaxerxes' Throne;

In expatiating on the Beauty of theſe Lines, it hath been obſerved, that Milton hath here "deſcribed the haſty Changes "of the Paſſions and Counſels of the an-"cient Orators, in the very Movements "of his Verſe; at the ſame Time expreſ-"ſing the *Vim Demoſthenis,* the Force or "Vehemence of Demoſthenes, in the "mere Situation of the Words *fierce* and "*reſiſtleſs,* with an equal Burſt of Thun-"der ſhaking the Arſenal, and Light'ning "at once over Greece to Macedon, and "the diſtant Throne of Artaxerxes; that "is, in the Apprehenſion of thoſe Ages, "from one End of the Earth to another, "with a like *Vehemence,* Propriety and "*Rapidity* of Numbers *."

* *Say,* on the Harmony of Numbers.

That

That theſe Verſes contain much of that *Vehemence*, *Propriety*, and *Rapidity* of Expreſſion, which is imputed to them, I do readily admit; but if the Numbers, of which they are compoſed, are juſtly eſtimated by the Succeſſion of long and ſhort Syllables, I cannot ſee how their Force or Propriety depends merely on their *Numbers*: For certain it is, that the Harmony and Mode of Expreſſion in the following Verſes is totally different; and yet there is exactly the ſame Succeſſion of long and ſhort Syllables, or the ſame Numbers in them as in the preceding:

——————— The lofty Ship
Rode buoyant o'er the liquid Element,
Wafted by Winds, that blew in Symphony:
Not Goſſamers e'er wanton'd in the Breeze
So placid, as her artificial Wings.

The Reader will ſee that, in this Imitation, I have not taken the Liberty to ſubſtitute *Accent* for *Quantity*; but have preſerved not only the ſame Succeſſion of long and ſhort Syllables, but have placed the very Accents in the ſame Parts of the Lines, and have even imitated the Sounds, as far as the Subject would admit. This will

be more conſpicuous on viewing them cloſer together.

Thoſe Ancient, whoſe reſiſtleſs Eloquence
Rode buoyant o'er the liquid Element,
Wielded at Will that fierce Democratie,
Wafted by Winds, that blew in Symphony,
Shook th' Arſenal and fulmin'd over Greece,
Not Goſſamers e'er wanton'd in the Breeze
To Macedon, and Artaxerxes' Throne;
So placid, as her artificial Wings.

We find none of the Powers of Thunder and Lightning, that

Shook th' Arſenal, and fulmin'd over Greece,
To Macedon, and Artaxerxes' Throne;

in the Numbers of the correſponding Lines,

Not Goſſamers e'er wanton'd in the Breeze
So placid, as her artificial Wings.

And yet the Accents, and even literal Conſtruction of the Syllables, are very nearly the ſame.

It is very evident, on thus comparing theſe two Paſſages, that ſomething more than *Time* muſt enter into the Compoſition of Engliſh Numbers. I am, indeed, ſurpriſed

priſed to find this ancient Criterion of Quantity, ſo much inſiſted on, as it is, by Writers who have been reduced to the Neceſſity of conſtantly breaking thro' their own Rules, to accommodate the Syllables in ſome Verſes, to their imaginary Numbers.

The following Verſes Mr. Maſon calls Anapæſtic, and ſcans thus.

⏑ With Hearts bold and ſtout,
⏑ We'll repel the vile Rout,
⏑ And follow fair Liberty's Call;
⏑ We'll ruſh on the Foe,
⏑ And deal Death in each Blow,
⏑ Till Conqueſt and Honour, crown all.

According to this Method of ſcanning, the Words *bold*, *we'll*, *vile*, *fair*, *deal*, *each*, *crown*, which are all naturally *long* Syllables, and moſt of them emphatical beſides, are yet marked *ſhort*. On the other hand, the laſt Syllable in *repel* is made long, tho' naturally ſhort, and not to be lengthened by the Accent; as are alſo the firſt Syllables in *follow*, *liberty*, *conqueſt*, and *honour*; all of the ſame Nature. Nothing, ſurely, can be more palpable than the Abſurdity of making *pel* long in the very ſame Line

in which *vile* is made ſhort! The ſame may be ſaid of *deal* and *death*; the former of which is made ſhort, and the latter long.

In Speaking of Verſes, written for Muſic, Mr. Maſon very judiciouſly obſerves, that the Length of the Notes and Syllables ſhould be adapted to each other. But let us ſuppoſe that the above Stanza was thus ſet to Muſic; how would it ſound if ſung, in Recitative? Muſt not ſome of the Syllables be lengthened, and others contracted in their Articulation thus?

With Hartes buld and ſtout, | wel re-pale the vil rout,
And ſolo fer Leeburtis Call;
Wel ruſhe on the Foe,
And del Deathe in ech Blow,
Till Conequeſt, and Honer, crun all.

The Reader will judge how far Nature or Truth are conſulted in ſuch a Syſtem of Proſody.

It is needleſs to multiply Examples, in order to ſet this Difference between ancient and modern Numbers in a ſtronger

Point

Point of View. It is, therefore, a vain and fruitleſs Attempt to make one the Criterion of the other; nor have the *modern* Poets, who have endeavoured to imitate the Numbers of the Ancients *, been leſs ſucceſsful in their Compoſitions, than the Critics, who have endeavoured to reconcile the Numbers of modern and ancient Poetry to the ſame Standard. As the ill Succeſs of the former, however, hath ſufficiently ſhewn, that modern Languages do not admit of a Kind of Verſe altogether dependent on long and ſhort Syllables; ſo one would have thought the latter might have been thence induced to conſult *Nature*, rather than Authority, in their future Tracts on this Subject †.

Not that I deny the real Exiſtence of this Species of Modulation; but what I contend for, is, that ſuch Meaſures are merely *muſical*, and not *poetical*; being adapted ſolely to ſuch Verſes as are written to be ſung. It is very eaſy to write

* Of theſe were *Jodelle* among the French, and *D'Avenant* among the Engliſh.

† It is for this Reaſon, that all Attempts of this Kind are, at beſt, but literary Trifling, ſerving only *To make th' Unlearned ſtare, the Learned ſmile.*

Engliſh Anapæſtic Verſes*; but the above are not ſuch, becauſe they cannot be properly ſet to Muſic, without altering the natural Length of the Syllables. It is alſo poſſible to write *Iambic*, *Trochaic*, *Hexameter*, and every other Species of ancient Verſe, in Engliſh; but, while Emphaſis and Accent have ſo great a Share in the Compoſition of our Numbers, a bare Attention to the Length of Syllables would make but very lame and imperfect Verſes.

Perhaps one great Reaſon for Writers having fallen into Miſtakes on this Head, hath been their Neglect to make the proper Diſtinction between ſuch Poetry as is written for Muſic, or intended to be ſung, and ſuch as hath been written merely to be read. Indifferent Poets have been

* For Inſtance, the following Stanza is, perhaps, as purely Anapæſtic as our Language will permit, or the Critics may require.

We are lazy and ſtout,
So that hearing a Rout,
Of a Bull, or a Bear, let it be;
With Delight we partake,
Of the Sports of the Wake,
Very joyous, indulging, our Glee.

ſome-

ſometimes told in Raillery, that their Verſes might be either *ſaid* or *ſung*. It is certain, however, that the greateſt Defect of moſt Verſes, is, that they can neither be *ſung* nor *ſaid*.

I do not know that any Writer hath taken Notice of this Diſtinction as being a very *eſſential* one in modern Poetry; and yet it certainly is ſo. In the Compoſition of heroic or other Poeſy, intended for ſimple Recital, the *Accent* or Streſs of the Voice, may ſupply the Want of *Time* in any Syllable; but, as it does not actually lengthen ſhort Syllables, it will not anſwer the ſame End in Verſes that are to be *ſung*. Time is ſo very eſſential to Melody in Muſic, that nothing can ſupply its Place. It is neceſſary, therefore, in Verſes written to be ſung, that the natural Length of Syllables be conſtantly preſerved; and that a ſhort Syllable, however ſtrongly accented, ſhould never be adapted to a long Note inſtead of a Syllable naturally long.

It is farther neceſſary alſo that the *Feet* ſhould either be all of equal Length, or that they ſhould be ſo proportioned in their

their Succeſſion, as that they might be meaſured *per Arſin et Theſin* *; without which it is impoſſible that the Expreſſions of the Muſic, and of the Poetry, ſhould coincide.

And yet ſo little are theſe Circumſtances attended to, either by our *Compoſers* or Writers, that we have the Mortification to ſee our *vocal* Muſic in a State almoſt beneath Contempt, while that of *inſtrumental* Muſic advances daily towards Perfection.

But the farther Purſuit of this Subject would be foreign to my preſent Purpoſe; which is to conſider Poetry, ſimply as it is to be *read*, not as it is to be *ſung*. In this View, the Circumſtance of *Time*, as it enters into the Compoſition of metrical Feet, is of no greater Importance to the Power and Harmony of Engliſh Numbers than that of the Force or Energy of the Voices or Syllables compoſing them; for I preſume it hath been made ſufficiently clear, that the Power and Harmony of Engliſh Numbers, do not conſiſt

* Commonly called, by the Muſicians, *beating Time*.

merely

merely in the Combination of long and ſhort Syllables. Nay, it will ſtill bear ſome Diſpute whether the ancient Numbers conſiſted ſolely in this Particular; eſpecially if we credit the wonderful Stories that are told us of their Effects, both in the Declamations of their Orators, and the Writings of their Poets. I have ſomewhere read of a Pedant, who aſſerted there was more true Harmony to be found in the Latin and Greek Hexameters of Virgil and Homer, than in the fineſt Airs that ever were compoſed by Handel or Corelli. In like manner, Mr. Sheridan tells us, that "Foreigners uſed to liſten "to the Greek Orators, though they did "not underſtand their Language, with as "much Pleaſure as we do to the Italian "Singers, from the mere Delight they "took in the Harmony of their Utter-"ance." But, if this be true, one can hardly imagine ſuch Harmony dependent merely on the Modification of Times, or the Succeſſion and Combination, however artful, of long and ſhort Syllables. And yet ſome Writers maintain, that the Greeks uſed to read always according to Quantity.

Sup-

Suppoſing this Point, however, to be controvertible, and that they diverſified the Tone of their Syllables in Reading; ſtill preſerving the Mode of Time; this would only make their Speaking ſtill more reſemble Singing. And, if we may form any Judgment of the Effects of vocal Muſic among the Ancients, from what we find among the Moderns, we ſhall not be over ready to attribute ſuch aſtoniſhing Effects to the Influence of muſical Recitative.

Nothing appears more probable, than that we are ignorant of ſome Circumſtances which contributed to the Influence of ancient Numbers; for let a Modern recite their Compoſitions how he will, we find none of thoſe Effects from ſuch Recital, as are related of the Declamations of the Greeks themſelves.

The Prejudices of thoſe who are enthuſiaſtically fond of Antiquity, may inſpire them with wonderful Conceits, like that of the Pedant above-mentioned; but I will venture to ſay, the beſt Greek Scholar in both Univerſities, might rehearſe the Orations of Demoſthenes till his Lungs were tired, before he would find People liſten

to him with the ſame Pleaſure, as they take in hearing an Italian Singer recite the harmonious Verſes of Metaſtaſio.

Be all this, however, as it may, it is certain that the Conſtitution of Engliſh Numbers depends no leſs on the Strength and Weakneſs of the Voices compoſing them, than they do on their Length, *i. e.* their being uttered quick or ſlow.

Nor, indeed, are theſe the only Ingredients in their Compoſition. The Circumſtances of *Harſhneſs* and *Smoothneſs* are likewiſe to be conſidered. Theſe are compatible both with *ſtrong* and *weak*, *long* and *ſhort* Sounds; ſo that a Meaſure or Foot, in Engliſh Verſe, hath three eſſential Qualities in its Compoſition; the Syllables of which it is compoſed being either *long* or *ſhort*, *loud* or *ſoft*, *harſh* or *ſmooth*. And hence ariſes that expreſſive and beautiful Variety we find in them, without our being obliged to ſound them in different Tones, as if we were Singing, inſtead of Speaking.

To determine, however, in what Manner theſe ſeveral Qualities of Syllables are blended in the Compoſition of metrical Feet, and in what Caſes they may be ſubſtituted

ſtituted for each other, is a Taſk too arduous to be included in the preſent Deſign †.

But were we perfectly acquainted with the Myſtery of ſimple Numbers, as far as the Compoſition of each is ſeparately concerned, we might ſtill, nevertheleſs, have an imperfect Knowledge of thoſe Circumſtances, on which the Power and Harmony of numerous Compoſition depend. Numbers are but the Materials with which

——— *to build the lofty Rime*;

it being from their artful Combination and Succeſſion, that their Force and Beauty are properly diſplayed, as the ſame Feet, differently diſpoſed, may form Verſes very different both in Melody and Energy.

† The following, however, would be no incurious Problems to reſolve: 1ſt. Why doth *Force*, i. e. the Streſs of the Voice in Accent and Emphaſis, ſupply the Place of *Time* in Engliſh Numbers? And in what Manner do they compenſate each other? 2d. Are not *harſh* Sounds in Poetry introduced, like *Diſcords* in Muſic, to improve the Harmony, and with the ſame Succeſs? —

SECT.

SECT. XII. *On the Mechaniſm and Harmony of Engliſh Verſe.*

Will it be ſaid, " that, however in-
" ſufficient the Modes of *Tone* and *Time*
" are to explain the Energy and Harmony
" of Engliſh Numbers, their Combina-
" tion muſt yet neceſſarily break in upon
" the *Propriety* of reciting *Poetry*, if poet-
" ical *Pauſe* and *Cadence* are to be in any
" Degree obſerved, in Reading."

It is very true, it would ſo, in the Recital of moſt Poetry, eſpecially if the Modulation of the Voice were regulated by the common Rules of Pauſe and Cadence. But the Diſtinction already made, between that Poetry which is to be *ſung*, and that which is to be *ſaid*, will aſſiſt us in ſetting this Matter in a true Light.

To this End, I ſhall begin with ſhewing the Difference between that natural Modulation of Voice which is common to Speech, and that arbitrary and mechanical Modulation which is peculiar to Poetry.

It has been obſerved, in the ſecond Section, that a Number of Syllables pronounced

nounced ſucccеſſively in one uniform and unvaried Manner (that is, equally loud and long) would appear only as ſo many ſurd and unmeaning Sounds; and that therefore the Voice naturally falls into a Kind of Modulation in Speaking. This was exemplified in the following Words.

Be, what, you, will, ſo, you, be, ſtill, the, ſame.

The Reaſon, however, why theſe Words ſo pronounced would be in a Manner unintelligible, is, that they would thus be deprived of the moſt eſſential Part of oral *Expreſſion*, which conſiſts in laying the Streſs or Emphaſis of Voice on Words or Syllables, in Proportion as they are ſignificant; ſo that, the Words compoſing the above Line not being equally ſignificant, there is a Want of *Expreſſion* in ſuch an uniform Mode of Utterance. But let us ſuppoſe the following Line ſubſtituted in its Room.

Tow'rds four fair Nymphs, ran four tall Men full Speed.

In this Line, it is evident, that every Word ſhould be pronounced equally ſtrong, and in the ſame uniform Manner; all the Modu-

Modulation it will admit of, being formed by the ſlight Pauſe at the Comma in the Middle. For if it be read otherwiſe, *i. e.* with any other Modulation, it would loſe its *Expreſſion*.

Thus, ſhould we, for Inſtance, repeat it as an heroic Verſe, after the common Method, it would run thus :

Words four fer Nymphs, ran four tol Men full Speed.

Here we ſee that the arbitrary and artificial Modulation of the Verſe, breaks in upon that natural Modulation, which is eſſential to Expreſſion. It is this Difference between the natural and artificial Modulation of Proſe and Verſe, that hath induced ſome Writers on the Art of Reading, to lay it down as a poſitive Rule, that when you read Verſe, you muſt not in the leaſt attend to the Meaſure, the ſame Rules being to be obſerved in reading Poetry as in Proſe.

But is not this the ſame Thing as to ſay that Poetry cannot be read at all, or at leaſt no otherwiſe than as Proſe? This, however, is not true. The Modulation, or mechanical Diſpoſition of Pauſes in

Poetry, is merely muſical, and conſiſts in the Modification or Combination of *Times*, or temporal Meaſures; and this is always reconcileable to the natural Modulation of Expreſſion, when the Poet chuſes to make it ſo. But, as in the Mechaniſm of Engliſh Verſe, the Streſs of the Voice is admitted to ſupply the Place of Time, the Poet frequently neglects the ſtrict Obſervance of *Time* in Poems that are to be *read*; and, on the other hand, equally neglects the Obſervance of Accent in thoſe which are to be *ſung*.

Hence ariſe the Defects obſerved in the preceding Section, where the Reader will ſee Inſtances of ſtrong emphatical Words ſo placed in the Meaſure, that they neceſſarily loſe their Expreſſion when repeated in the ſame Mode of Time as that in which they are ſung. This is very common in Songs, and all Pieces written to Ballad Meaſures.

Such Liberties are taken in this Kind of Writing, that we find not only long and accented Syllables put in the Place of the ſhort and unaccented, but even two Syllables put in the Place of one, and

ſung

ſung to one Note, and ſometimes even one Syllable made to ſerve two diſtinct Notes †.

So little Attention, indeed, hath been paid to the true Cauſe of poetical Pauſe and Cadence, that we have very pretty Poets, and even judicious Critics, that have been miſtaken in the Proportion of

† Example of a long accented Syllable put in the Place of a ſhort one, adapted to the ſame Note.

I.

What though I have Skill to complain,
And the Muſes my Temples have crown'd?
What though, when they hear my *ſoft* Strain,
The Siſters ſit weeping around?

II.

Ah! Colin, 'tis all but in vain,
Thy Pipe and thy Laurel reſign;
Thy fair One inclines to *a* Swain,
Whoſe Muſic is ſweeter than thine.

There are few Verſes better written for Muſic than theſe; and yet the Word *ſoft*, in the third Line of the firſt Stanza, is long and emphatical, inſtead of being ſhort and inſignificant as *a* in the third Line of the ſecond Stanza, which anſwers, nevertheleſs, to the ſame Note. In Verſes written with leſs Taſte and Care, the Blunders of this Kind are as diſagreeable to the Hearer, as troubleſome to the Singer.

Time taken up in the Repetition of the ſeveral Parts of a Verſe.

Mr. Webb, in his Remarks on the Beauties of Poetry, endeavours to account for the Monotony frequently to be met with in Mr. Pope's Verſes, by imputing it to the Equality of Time, by which his Lines are divided. He inſtances, in particular, the following Paſſage from the Eſſay on Man.

All are but Parts of one ſtupendous Whole,
Whoſe Body Nature is, and God the Soul;
That chang'd through all, and yet in all the ſame,
Great in the Earth, as in th' Æthereal Frame;
Warms in the Sun, refreſhes in the Breeze,
Glows in the Stars, and bloſſoms in the Trees;
Lives through all Life, extends through all Extent,
Spreads undivided, operates unſpent.

" Every Reader (ſays this Author) muſt " feel the ill Effect of the Monotony in " theſe Lines; the Cauſe of it is ob- " vious; this Verſe conſiſts of ten Syllables, or five Feet. When the Pauſe " falls on the fourth Syllable, we ſhall " find that we pronounce the ſix laſt in " the ſame Time that we do the four firſt; " ſo that the Couplet is not only divided

" into

" into two equal Lines, but each Line,
" with reſpect to Time, is divided into
" two equal Parts, as,

" Warms in the Sun, || refreſhes in the Breeze,
" Glows in the Stars, || and bloſſoms in the Trees."

This Obſervation of Mr. Webb's, is approved by the ingenious Authors of the Monthly Review; who, in their Illuſtration of his Remarks, give the following muſical Diagram of the firſt of theſe Lines.

Warms in the Sun, refreſhes in the Breeze.

I ſhould be glad, however, to know by what Authority, and for what Reaſon the Words, *in the*, are made *Crotchets* in the firſt Bar, and only *Quavers* in the ſecond? They are equally emphatical in both Parts of the Sentence. Again, I ſhould like to have a Reaſon given me, why theſe Words, *in the*, and even the accented Syllable *freſh* in *refreſhes*, are accounted each but half as long as the Syllable *re* in the ſame Word? Never could

Time taken up in the Repetition of the ſeveral Parts of a Verſe.

Mr. Webb, in his Remarks on the Beauties of Poetry, endeavours to account for the Monotony frequently to be met with in Mr. Pope's Verſes, by imputing it to the Equality of Time, by which his Lines are divided. He inſtances, in particular, the following Paſſage from the Eſſay on Man.

> All are but Parts of one ſtupendous Whole,
> Whoſe Body Nature is, and God the Soul;
> That chang'd through all, and yet in all the ſame,
> Great in the Earth, as in th' Æthereal Frame;
> Warms in the Sun, refreſhes in the Breeze,
> Glows in the Stars, and bloſſoms in the Trees;
> Lives through all Life, extends through all Extent,
> Spreads undivided, operates unſpent.

" Every Reader (ſays this Author) muſt " feel the ill Effect of the Monotony in " theſe Lines; the Cauſe of it is ob- " vious; this Verſe conſiſts of ten Sylla- " bles, or five Feet. When the Pauſe " falls on the fourth Syllable, we ſhall " find that we pronounce the ſix laſt in " the ſame Time that we do the four firſt; " ſo that the Couplet is not only divided

" into

" into two equal Lines, but each Line,
" with reſpect to Time, is divided into
" two equal Parts, as,

" Warms in the Sun, || refreſhes in the Breeze,
" Glows in the Stars, || and bloſſoms in the Trees."

This Obſervation of Mr. Webb's, is approved by the ingenious Authors of the Monthly Review; who, in their Illuſtration of his Remarks, give the following muſical Diagram of the firſt of theſe Lines.

Warms in the Sun, refreſhes in the Breeze.

I ſhould be glad, however, to know by what Authority, and for what Reaſon the Words, *in the*, are made *Crotchets* in the firſt Bar, and only *Quavers* in the ſecond? They are equally emphatical in both Parts of the Sentence. Again, I ſhould like to have a Reaſon given me, why theſe Words, *in the*, and even the accented Syllable *freſh* in *refreſhes*, are accounted each but half as long as the Syllable *re* in the ſame Word? Never could

there be a Man upon Earth that pronounced the above Line as it is thus written.

There can be no Argument brought againſt pronouncing *in the*, in both Parts of the Sentence exactly alike. Let us ſee then how the other Words accord, to juſtify Mr. Webb's Aſſertion, that "the "Verſe is, with reſpect to *Time*, divided "into two equal Parts."

Warms in the Sun,
Refreſhes in the Breeze.

It is amazing to me, how any Perſon that hath an Ear, could ſuppoſe theſe two Parts of the Line to be iſochronal. Even the Word *Breeze* is longer than *Sun*, and how *warms* can be ſuppoſed to take up as much Time as *refreſhes*, I can't conceive. A Muſician, indeed, might have divided the Line at the fifth Syllable, and have pricked the Notes, and beat Time accordingly; but this would be a Stretch beyond *poetical* Licence.

But, even ſuppoſing the above Line to be equally divided in Point of Time, ſuch Equality cannot, ſtrictly ſpeaking, be the Cauſe of *Monotony*, unleſs the Accents alſo were

were laid in the ſame Places. A Kind of Monotony, indeed, ariſes from the Succeſſion of ſome of the above Lines, becauſe the Accents in the Beginning of them lie upon the ſame Syllables;

e. g. *Gréat in the Eárth* —
Warms in the Sun —
Glows in the Stars —

If the Seat of the Accents, however, be varied, let the Equality of the Pauſes be as exact as it will, it will be productive rather of a *Monochrony* (if I may uſe the Term) than a *Monotony*. And thus we ſee, in every Caſe, what Confuſion is occaſioned by the Want of having made a proper Diſtinction between *Tone* and *Time*, in treating Subjects of rhetorical and poetical Harmony †.

† In Speaking of the Pitch and Management of the Voice, however, Mr. Sheridan appears to be ſenſible of this Diſtinction. "Loud and ſoft, ſays he, in Speaking, is like "the *forte* and *piano* in Muſic; it only *refers* to the dif-"ferent Degrees of Force uſed in the ſame Key: Whereas "high and low *imply* a Change of Key." And yet he makes no Uſe of this Diſtinction, in treating of Accent and artificial Tones; altho' nothing can be more certain than that we do not change the Key in Speaking at every Pauſe.

Not that I ſuppoſe by the Word *Monotony*, thus generally uſed, the Critics meant to confine themſelves to Tone, in the ſtrict philoſophical Senſe of the Term, but to extend it alſo to the *Streſs* or *Loudneſs* of the Voice. In this Senſe, however, their confounding its Effects with thoſe of Time, is equally exceptionable. It is very certain, that the Meaſures of Time, in the mechanical Structure of the Verſe, ought to be ſtrictly obſerved, as well in *Reading* as in *Writing* all ſuch Poetry, as is to be ſet to *Muſic*; becauſe, as before obſerved, Time is eſſential to muſical Harmony; and the Expreſſion ſhould be made to coincide with it. But as it is by no means ſo eſſential to Speech, or poetical Harmony, no mechanical Syſtem, or arbitrary Mode of Pauſe and Cadence *, ſhould take place in

* It is to be conſtantly obſerved, that, by *Cadence*, is not meant a Variation from *high* to *low*, as is generally underſtood, but from *loud* to *ſoft*; this being all the Cadence Propriety will admit of, in *Speaking* and *Reading*: That Diverſification of Tone, which I treat of hereafter, and which depends on the Senſe of the Period, being very improperly termed *Cadence*.—The Diſtinction here made between muſical and poetical Harmony, is not new or ſingular. The celebrated Author of ELFRIDA, ſays, that the

in Proſe, or in any Kind of Poetry; to the Prejudice of natural *Expreſſion*.

I do not deny, that Harmony is produced by a regular and mechanical Combination of long and ſhort, loud and ſoft Sounds: Such Combination is, in many of our Odes, eſpecially when heightened by chaſte Rhimes, extremely pleaſing. But if the Succeſſion of thoſe Sounds be too uniform, either in reſpect to Accent or Time, it will neceſſarily fatigue, and be diſpleaſing to the Ear. I can diſcover, however, but very little Harmony in the mere uniform and alternate Succeſſion of a long and ſhort, or a loud and ſoft Syllable, as is required, by our Proſodiſts, in the Mechaniſm of our Engliſh heroic Verſes of ten Syllables.

It is evident, indeed, that there really is but very little; ſince the ſimple Repetition of a very few Lines, written in this unvaried Manner, is intolerably tireſome. If the Reader doubts of this, he may try the Experiment on Pope's Homer, moſt

the different Cadences, &c. without which modern *Muſic* cannot ſubſiſt, are entirely improper for the Expreſſion of *Poetry*.

of

of Addiſon's Poems, and particularly on Mr. Glover's Leonidas. It is true, the Uniformity of Sound, in reciting theſe Poems, is varied a little by diverſifying the Pauſes made in the Recital; but the common Rules laid down for the harmonious Diverſification of ſuch Pauſes are as arbitrary, and as inconſiſtent with natural Expreſſion, as thoſe which concern the Succeſſion and Combination of the Meaſures; nor are Writers agreed even about theſe Rules.

Mr. Maſon ſays, "that there is the "ſame poſſible Variation of the Cæſural "Pauſe in *Engliſh*, as there is in the *Latin* "Heroics." He admits, however, with Lord Kaims and others, that it is *unnatural* for a Pauſe to divide a Word. Now I ſhould be pleaſed to know from what *natural* Principles it is, that they deduce their Rule for pauſing at ſome particular Parts of the Verſe, in Preference to others?

In the Elements of Criticiſm *, we find this Point greatly laboured, and an apparently accurate Diſtinction made be-

* Vol. ii. Page 409.

tween

tween Pauſes and *Semi*-pauſes. But Pauſes are not exactly ſplit in two, any more than Syllables; but are of different Lengths, and are diverſified as the Variety of Expreſſion requires. What the noble Author advances on this Head, therefore, is in a great Degree chimerical. Mr. Say hath ſhewn, from the Practice of Milton, that the Pauſe may be made with Beauty and Propriety in every Part of the Line in heroic Verſe †.

This, however, cannot be, if the alternate Succeſſion of long and ſhort Syllables, and a mechanical Regularity of Pauſe be deemed eſſential to ſuch Verſe. It is aſſerted, as before obſerved, by Johnſon and others, that the Harmony of Verſe is more or leſs compleat, as ſuch mechanical Regularity is adhered to; but I will appeal to the Reader, after he hath peruſed the following Lines, from Dryden, Pope, Addiſon, &c. whoſe Examples are brought in favour of the regular Mechaniſm; and from Milton alone, in Juſtification of the irregular.

† Eſſay on the Numbers of Paradiſe Loſt, Page 136.

In

In Mr. POPE's Paſtorals, we have the following Deſcription of *Winter*.

Behold the Groves, that ſhine with ſilver Froſt,
Their Beauty wither'd, and their Verdure loſt!
No grateful Dews deſcend from Evening Skies;
No Morning Odours from the Flowers ariſe;
No rich Perfumes refreſh the fruitful Field;
No fragrant Herbs their native Incenſe yield!
The balmy Zephyrs, ſilent ſince her Death,
Lament the ceaſing of a ſweeter Breath.

Again, in his Deſcription of *Summer*,

But ſee, the Shepherds ſhun the Noon-day Heat;
The lowing Herds to murm'ring Brooks retreat;
To cloſer Shades the panting Flocks remove;
Ye Gods! and is there no Retreat for Love?

DRYDEN, equally regular in his Numbers, on a very different Subject, makes Juvenal ſatirize the Romans for their Neglect in cultivating their own Language, in the following Terms.

In Greece their whole Accompliſhments they ſeek:
Their Faſhion, Breeding, Language, muſt be Greek:
But raw, in all that does to Rome belong,
They ſcorn to cultivate their Mother-Tongue.
In Greek they flatter, all their Fears they ſpeak,
Tell all their Secrets; nay, they ſcold in Greek.

Mr. ADDISON, in the following Verſes, gives as much Melody to this mechanical Form

Form of Verſification, as perhaps it is capable of admitting.

For whereſoe'er I turn my raviſh'd Eyes,
Gay gilded Scenes, and ſhining Proſpects, riſe:
Poetic Fields encompaſs me around,
And ſtill I ſeem to tread on claſſic Ground:
For here the Muſe ſo oft her Harp has ſtrung,
That not a Mountain rears his Head unſung;
Renown'd in Verſe each ſhady Thicket grows,
And every Stream in heavenly Murmurs flows.

That there is a Species of Harmony reſulting from the Regularity of theſe Lines, is not to be diſputed; but is it equal to that of the following Verſes of Milton, wherein this Regularity of Meaſure is broken through, and the Pauſes made in every Part of the Line?

——————— Yet not the more
Ceaſe I to wander, where the Muſes haunt,
Clear Spring, or ſhady Grove, or ſunny Hill;
Smit with the Love of ſacred Song; but chief
Thee, Sion, and the flow'ry Brooks beneath,
That waſh thy hallow'd Feet, and warbling flow,
Nightly I viſit. ———————
Then feed on Thoughts, that voluntary move
Harmonious Numbers: As the wakeful Bird
Sings darkling; and in ſhadieſt Covert hid,
Tunes her nocturnal Note. ———————

PARADISE LOST, Book iii.

In

In the following Paſſages, taken from the ſame Poem, the regular Mode of alternate long and ſhort Syllables, is equally broken through, and with equal Harmony.

——— Thammuz came next, behind,
Whoſe annual Wound, in Lebanon, allur'd
The Syrian Damſels, to lament his Fate,
In amorous Ditties, all a Summer's Day;
While ſmooth Adonis, from his native Rock,
Ran Purple to the Sea. ———

Harmony
So ſmooths her charming Tones, that God's own Ear
Liſtens delighted.

Might it not be ſaid of the Numbers of theſe, and many other ſimilar Paſſages in Milton, in the Language of *Comus*;

How ſweetly did they float upon the Wings
Of Silence!
At every Fall ſmoothing the raven Down
Of Darkneſs till it ſmil'd ———
Such Sounds as theſe will take th' enchanted Soul
And lap it in Elyſium?

I am not inſenſible that Readers, whoſe Taſte is vitiated by their having been accuſtomed to the unvaried Uniformity of Numbers in our *correct* modern Poets, will at firſt be at a Loſs to conceive, wherein the ſuperior Harmony of Milton's Verſes con-

conſiſts. No Matter; they muſt have very debauched Ears, indeed, if they do not perceive the Fact, which is all I aim at for the preſent. They may think, perhaps, there is no other Way of ſcanning Engliſh Verſes, than by laying a ſtrong Accent on every even Syllable,

With Midas' Ears committing ſhort and long.

I ſhall endeavour, before I diſmiſs this Subject, however, to point out a much more general and ſatisfactory one; equally applicable to all Kinds of Poetry: For it is to be obſerved, that Variety in Meaſures and Pauſes, is not a mere Indulgence (as it is commonly ſuppoſed) allowed to *Blank* Verſe. Poems in *Rhime*, if well written, will admit of equal Variety, without the Neceſſity of Sinking the Rhime; but I do not pretend that they would be as *eaſily written*.

Thus, in two Paſſages from Addiſon and Prior, quoted by Mr. Say, we have an Inſtance of this Variety, being, in ſome Degree, ſucceſsfully put in Practice.

So when an Angel, by Divine Command,
With riſing Tempeſts, ſhakes a guilty Land;

Such

Such as, of late, o'er pale Britannia paſt,
Calm and ſerene, he drives the furious Blaſt;
And, pleas'd th' Almighty's Orders to perform,
Rides in the Whirlwind, and directs the Storm.

ADDISON'S CAMPAIGN.

When great Auguſtus govern'd ancient Rome,
And ſent his conquering Bands to foreign Wars:
Abroad when dreaded, and belov'd at home,
He ſaw his Fame increaſing with his Years;
Horace, great Bard, ſo Fate ordain'd, aroſe:
And bold as were his Countrymen in Fight,
Snatch'd their fair Actions from degrading Proſe,
And ſet their Battles in eternal Light.

PRIOR. *Ode on the Battle of Ramellies.*

That Blank Verſe hath an Advantage over Rhime, in the Admiſſion of a greater Variety in its Harmony, as Mr. Say and others aſſert, is not abſolutely denied: But of what Kind is this Advantage? I believe it will be found rather an Advantage to the *Writer* than the *Reader*.

It is ſaid to be very difficult, to expreſs the various Paſſions and Emotions of the Mind with Propriety in Rhime. It undoubtedly is ſo; but that it is not impoſſible, hath been confeſſedly ſhewn by Spenſer, Waller, Dryden, and many others *.

* See Dryden's Fables; and particularly Theodore and Honoria from Boccace; and his Cock and Fox from Chaucer.

Till

Till it be proved, therefore, that the Verſe, which is written with *leaſt Difficulty*, gives the greateſt Pleaſure to the Reader, I ſhall never conceive it properly ſaid that Blank-Verſe hath an Advantage over Rhime. That Blank-Verſe-Writers have an Advantage over thoſe who write in Rhime, is certain; as their Defects are leſs obvious to common Readers; and were they bound to the Shackles (as they are called *) of Rhime, they would never be capable of making a Verſe as long as they lived. But this is no Standard of the Merit of the Verſes when written. It is very poſſible, though I will not ſay it is very eaſy, to give Poems, written in Rhime, all the Variety of Meaſure and Pauſe which Blank-Verſe is capable of, without diminiſhing any Part of that Harmony, of which Rhime is productive. This, however, is not to be done by the ſlovenly Way of running indiſcriminately the Senſe of one Line into one another, without Regard

* They might as well, however, compare a Lord-Mayor's Golden Chain, to the Iron Gyves of the Priſoners in Newgate. The Fetters of Rhime, as the Poet ſays, are worn not for reſtraint but *loveliеſt Ornament*.

to the Pauſes of natural Expreſſion; a Cuſtom neither authorized by Senſe or Sound. There is as much Difference between the Effects of Eaſe and Indolence, as between real Elegance, and the ridiculous Affectation of it. It is the Buſineſs of *true* Taſte to diſtinguiſh both.

After all, it is, nevertheleſs, certain that Rhime is better adapted to Stanzas written for Muſic, than to heroic Verſes intended to be read: Not, however, becauſe Rhime, in well-written Verſes, muſt of Neceſſity break through the Propriety of natural Expreſſion; but becauſe the Returns of Rhime have the greateſt Effect, when they are quick, and are made in Times exactly equal and regular.

There is alſo another Reaſon, the Cauſe of which will be explained hereafter; and that is, that the Length of an heroic Verſe is too great for the happy Succeſs of Rhime; which was originally adapted to very ſhort Meaſures, and ſhould have been rejected by the Poets when they exceeded eight Syllables; ſince it is very evident that the mechanical Structure, or regular Movement of our rhiming heroic

heroic Verſes, is derived from the Leontine Meaſures which chimed at every Hemiſtic.

We may laugh, indeed, at the barbarous Jingle of ſuch Verſes, becauſe they are really barbarous, if compared with the Hexameters of the Ancients. As to the Uſe and Effects of the Rhime itſelf, however, they are much more conſpicuous in ſuch Verſes: *e. g.* the following deſpicable Lines from Muretus and Salerna.

Brixia, veſtratis merdoſa Volumina vatis,
Non ſunt noſtrates tergere digna Nates.

Ut Vites pænam de potibus incipe Cænam.

De planctu cudo mitrum cum carmine nudo
Mingere cum bumbis, reſt eſt ſaluberrima lumbis.

It is plain that the Rhime in theſe Verſes, as well as in our Engliſh Stanzas*,

* Not the Stanzas of Spencer and Fairfax: which, inſtead of being an Exception to this Rule, are the ſtrongeſt Proofs of it; the Rhimes dragging after the long Lines in their Stanzas, making the Verſe ſometimes intolerably tedious and heavy to the Ear. In plaintive Compoſitions, indeed, this ſlow Return of the Rhime hath a pleaſing Effect; as, in Hammond's Love Elegies; and Grey's Elegy, written in a Church-yard. But this is a Species of Writing to which Rhime is in a peculiar Manner adapted.

ſerves to enliven the Meaſures, and give a Kind of Melody to the Verſe. But if, on the contrary, the Rhimes were only at the Cloſe of each Line, the very Intent and Deſign of them would be defeated.

As an Example of this, take the following Lines from Drayton's Polyolbion, where the Rhime is almoſt entirely uſeleſs.

Of all the Cambrian Shires their Heads that bear ſo high
And farth'ſt ſurvey their Soils with an ambitious Eye,
Mervinia for her Hills, as for their matchleſs Crowds,
The neareſt that are ſaid to kiſs the wand'ring Clouds,
Eſpecial Audience craves, offended with the Throng,
That ſhe of all the reſt neglected was ſo long;
Alledging for herſelf, when, through the Saxon's Pride
The Godlike Race of Brute to Severn's ſetting Side
Were cruelly inforced, her Mountains did relieve
Thoſe whom devouring War elſe every where did grieve.

In theſe Verſes the Rhime hath very little Effect either to enforce or diſturb the natural Expreſſion; ſo that were it not for the Tranſpoſition of the Words the whole might be read as Proſe, and ſome of it very indifferent Proſe too.

In heroic Verſes of *ten* Syllables, the Rhime hath a greater Effect than in the foregoing; but it is evident, by a capital

Pauſe

Pauſe uſually made in the Middle of each Line, dividing it into Hemiſtics, that a Rhime is there wanting to compleat the Melody, after the true Gothic Original.

The Truth is, that the Mechaniſm of Engliſh Verſe, as well as that of more modern Nations, is founded on heterogeneous Principles; which are not eaſily reconciled.

The moſt obvious Species of Poetic Harmony, and what is moſt likely to ſuggeſt itſelf to barbarous Nations, is that of Sound, abſtracted from Time. The Uſe of Time in Harmony becoming known only as People acquired ſome Idea of Muſic as a Science. The firſt Verſes that were written, therefore, in ſuch Languages as would admit of it, were probably in Rhime. Next to the Chiming of Sounds, an Equality in the Number of articulate Sounds, between that Chime, was a ſimple and obvious Improvement in Verſification. The Reſtraint, however, which the firſt Poets muſt lie under, in diverſifying their Subject, and expreſſing the various Emotions and Paſſions, by ſuch an uniform Iteration of Sounds, would naturally render

them impatient to throw it off, or change it for ſome other Species of Harmony more capable of Variety. It is no Wonder, therefore, that the Mode of Time or Quantity, took place, in ſuch Languages as would admit of it, in Proportion as the People grew civilized, and the Arts began to make themſelves known. Hence in the poliſhed Nations of ancient Greece and Rome, we find the Mode of Time or Quantity hath the chief Place in their Proſody; the Jingle of Sounds being entirely neglected.

Barbariſm having taken Poſſeſſion of Europe, for ſome Time, after the Deſtruction of theſe great Republics; we may ſuppoſe the Poetry of each Country to be in its earlieſt and rudeſt State; *viz.* conſtituted of mere Number and Rhime †.

It

† Mr. Johnſon, indeed, tells us, in his Hiſtory of the Engliſh Language, that "the firſt Poetry of the Saxons "was without Rhime, and conſequently muſt have de- "pended upon the QUANTITY [*meaning, as I apprehend, "the Variety of* LONG *and* SHORT] of their Syllables." In Time, however, he obſerves, "they began to imitate "their Neighbours, and cloſe their Verſes with correſ- "pondent Sounds."

Now

It was natural, at the Revival of Letters, for the monkiſh Writers, who poſſeſſed and ſought to propagate the ancient Learn-

Now, I will not enter into a Diſpute, whether the Mode of *Time* or of *Sound* were the moſt obvious of the two, in the Formation of poetical Harmony. As that of *Time*, however, ſeems, from the Example of the Greeks and Romans, to be the more perfect of the two, I ſhould hardly think the latter was hit upon firſt, and afterwards rejected for that of Sound. If it be ſo, however, it argues ſomething in Favour of that Practice, which was thus adopted after ſo good a Method was already known. Be this, however, as it may, Mr. Johnſon gives no Proof that the firſt Poetry of the Saxons was without Rhime; and, if he did, the Inference he draws, that its Harmony muſt have depended upon *Quantity*, viz. *Time*, does not follow. There is a Species of Melody ariſing from a Regularity in the Repetition of merely a certain Number of articulate Sounds, accompanied by a Variation in the Modes of *loud* and *ſoft*; where both *Time* and *Rhime* are neglected. There is alſo a Species of Melody ariſing from other Combinations.

Wormius informs us, that the ancient iſlandic Poets made Uſe of a great Variety of poetical Meaſures: He enumerates, indeed, no leſs than 136 different Kinds, beſides that of Rhime. He tells us alſo, that the Harmony of their Verſes did not depend on the *Quantity* of the Syllables, but conſiſted entirely in Alliteration. The Anglo-Saxon Poets alſo frequently made Uſe of the ſame Kind of Alliteration. There were farther, many other little Gothic Niceties, which ſerved to conſtitute a Species of Poetry among the early Bards.

ing, to endeavour, in their Latin Verſes, at uniting the claſſical and the barbarous Modes of Verſification; in order to recommend their Poems, by adapting them to the Taſte of the Times. At the ſame Time, as their Languages were daily improving by the Introduction of Latin and Greek Words, it was very natural for ſuch Writers, in compoſing Verſes in their own Tongue, to introduce in ſome Degree the ancient Mode of Proſody along with them.

It appears to have been from this Commixture that Engliſh Proſody hath taken its Riſe. And hence it is that we find Accent, or the Streſs of the Voice, ſubſtituted for the Length of its Utterance; and Rhime made Uſe of in Verſes to which Quantity ſeems better adapted.

Thus, from the Gothic Source we deduce the Rules laid down for an equal Number of Syllables; the alternate Movement of *loud* and *ſoft*; the mechanical Regularity of Pauſe, and Cadence, and Rhime.

From the claſſical Source, we deduce the Mode of Scanning by long and ſhort Sylla-

Syllables; of the Modulation of Feet and Meaſure *; and the true Method of forming harmonious Periods in general. The latter, however, is gained by ſtudying the Example, and imitating the Manner of the Ancients, not from purſuing any Precepts, to be deduced from them, applicable to our own Language.

To all this it may be objected, that, as Rhime is admitted to be peculiarly applicable to the Ode, and ſuch ſhort-lined Poetry, it is very ſtrange that the ancient Greeks and Romans, if Rhime had been ever known among them, ſhould have ſo totally excluded it even from thoſe very Pieces; whereas it is found very difficult, in moſt modern Languages, to write Poetry of almoſt any Kind without Rhime.

In Anſwer to this it may be obſerved, that it is more than probable the Greek and Latin Tongues, even in this earlieſt State, were ill adapted to Rhime: But

* Thus the ancient Meaſures, as hath been already obſerved, may be ſucceſsfully preſerved in Engliſh, as they really are, where they have a good Effect; as in Odes, Songs, &c. but then the Rhime muſt be preſerved likewiſe, or elſe they will ſeem very harſh and unharmonious to an Engliſh Ear; as is exemplified hereafter.

were

were it otherwiſe, it is no Wonder that a poliſhed and learned Nation ſhould effectually diſcountenance and ſuppreſs any Species of Writing, if the End intended to be anſwered by it, could be effected by a ſuperior Method. The Want of Examples, therefore, of Rhime to be found among the elegant Productions tranſmitted to us from the Ancients, is no Proof that the firſt Poetry of either the Greeks or Romans, was not written in Rhime. With regard to the latter Part of the Objection; it will be effectually invalidated, by taking a comparative View of the different Idiom and Conſtruction of the ancient and modern Languages.

The Engliſh, and all thoſe Tongues which retain any conſiderable Share of the Teutonic Stock and Idiom, are remarkably addicted to Rhime; the numerous Similarity of Sounds frequently cauſing us to fall into it in common Converſation. This is, by no Means, the Caſe with the Latin and Greek, as they were written in the Times of Homer, and of Virgil. It was, therefore, with great Propriety obſerved by the late ingenious Dr. Byrom,

that

that the Greeks and Romans did not avoid Rhime merely on the Account of the Meanneſs of its Harmony; but that their Language was unfit for it †.

On the other hand, the Engliſh Language is applicable with as little Succeſs to the Numbers of the Ancients. Thus,

† See his *Conteſt*, on this Subject, with Mr. Cumberbach: In which we have the following Lines, in Anſwer to his Antagoniſt's imputing Rhime to a falſe Taſte.

Rhime is falſe Taſte! — And then you add beſide —
And what the learned Ancients all avoid. —
What learned Ancients? Let me aſk *what all*
Into this Taſte were ſo afraid to fall?
For as to thoſe of Greek and Roman Stem
Avoiding Rhime — why Rhime avoided them.
Nature of Language, upon rhiming Feet
Forbad the two Antagoniſts to meet.
This is no more a Reaſon to defame
Our Rhimes in Engliſh, than for us to blame
The ſeveral Idioms, which thoſe Tongues have got,
And we *avoid* — that is, we *have them not*.

The Doctor's Opinion, however, is but little juſtified by his Practice in theſe Verſes; the Rhimes of which are certainly diſguſtful, as they break in upon the natural Expreſſion. It ſhould be an unvariable Rule with Rhimers to have the Pauſe of a Comma, at leaſt, at the Cloſe of every Line.

ſpeak-

ſpeaking of the Britiſh Muſe, the Doctor ſays,

——— When you chain her Lyrics to your Laws,
Then ſhe looks blank, and there ſhe makes a Pauſe;
As well ſhe may,—if all her Stock you veſt
In blank Iambic, and its varied Reſt:
One Edict farther, if your Preface goes,
Adieu to Poetry, and all is Proſe.

Mr. Maſon, indeed, is of Opinion, that "the ſoft Iambic, which the Engliſh Lan-"guage falls eaſily into, might have a "good Effect, even in Lyric Meaſure, "without Rhime." Mr. Cumberbach, Mr. Say, and others, have been of the ſame Opinion; which cannot be better confuted than by the Examples they themſelves have brought to juſtify the Aſſertion.

Mr. Say, gives us, among other Pieces of the ſame Kind, the following Imitation of the ſixteenth Ode of the third Book of Horace.

Danae, enclos'd in Tow'rs of Braſs,
Strong Iron Doors, and opening Dogs,
Wakeful, had well ſecur'd by Day,
Had well ſecur'd by Night;
If Jove and Venus had not mock'd
The jealous Sire—ſo Fables tell—

Vain

Vain Iron! vain Braſs! transform'd to Gold,
He won the greedy Maid.
When Gold appears, the Guards retire,
The Floods divide, the Rocks are rent;
Not Thunder flings the fiery Bolt
With ſuch reſiſtleſs Power.
Subjects their Kings, and Prieſts their Gods
Exchange for Gold. The Gownman Right
And Wrong confounds: For Gold he pleads,
For Gold betrays his Cauſe.
Touch'd by thy ſtronger Force, tow'rds thee
The Compaſs veers, almighty Gold!
Before thee Wiſdom, Valour, Senſe
And Virtue are no more! &c. &c.

Mr. Cumberbach hath attempted, in like manner, Horace's Ode in Praiſe of a Country Life; from which I ſhall alſo quote a few Stanzas.

Who thus amus'd forgets not ſoon
Love's ſoft Diſtreſs? perchance
A chaſte and loving Wife keeps neat
His Houſe and charming Babes,
Her Part ſuſtaining (happy State
Of Wedlock, often found
Beneath thatch'd Roof) laborious, ſwift,
And Sun-burnt, ſhe betimes
Upriſing, wholeſome Breakfaſt ſets
In order; or at Ev'n
Her weary Spouſe expecting, rears
The chearful Fire; now drains
Her milky Charge, rejoic'd to quit
Their ſwelling Load; now crowns
The ſparkling Bowl, and friendly heaps,
With Chear unbought the Board, &c.

How

How much more poetical is the Verſification of the ſame Ode, by the ingenious Author of the celebrated Paſtoral, *My Time, O ye Muſes*, &c.

While thus amus'd, and thus employ'd,
Who is there that would heed,
Would all the Miſchiefs dire abide,
That Love is wont to breed?
Or if a chaſte endearing Wife,
His rural Bliſs ſhall ſhare,
She chears the neat domeſtic Life,
Sweet prattling Babes her Care.
With ſmoth'ring Warmth prepar'd to burn
The dry old Log ſhe lays;
And, if her weary Spouſe return,
Revives the focal Blaze.
Of folded Flocks, from Dales and Hills,
The milky Treaſure ſtor'd;
Freſh clean-brew'd Wine ſhe draws, and fills,
With Chear unbought, the Board.

Dr. Watts, indeed, hath written an Ode on the Day of Judgment, in Imitation of the ancient Lyric Meaſure, which correſponds pretty exactly with the Time and Metre of the Sapphic; but even this doth by no Means prove the Aptitude of the Engliſh Language to the ancient Meaſures, or their Power of pleaſing a Modern Ear without Rhime.

It is certain, after all, that as Rhime loſes its Effect in long Verſes, and cannot be ſucceſsfully placed where there is not a natural Pauſe to be made in the Expreſſion, it is never uſed with ſo much Propriety as in Verſes of ſix or eight Syllables. To be convinced of this, we need only turn to the Tales and Fables of *Prior*, *Gay*, *Lloyd*, *Smart*, and ſome others; in which the Returns of the Rhime are made with ſo much Propriety and Eaſe, that they have all their Effect, without ever breaking in upon the Beauty of the natural Expreſſion; whereas, in the Structure of an heroic Verſe of ten Syllables, the Verſe is either divided by a Pauſe into Hemiſtics, or, if it admit no natural Pauſe, it degenerates into mere Proſe.

It appears, from the above Conſiderations eſſential to the Harmony of Verſe, that the natural Pauſes in the Expreſſion ſhould not be at too great a Diſtance. And hence it is that blank Verſe may be extremely harmonious, when compoſed of flowing Hemiſtics, though the Lines, taken ſeparately, do not accord with the Mechaniſm of the Couplet. To inſtance only the following Lines, taken from among

among many others of the like Nature in *Comus*, and in *Paradiſe Loſt*.

> At every fall ſmoothing the Raven down —
>
> Hov'ring on Wing, under the Cope of Heli —
>
> Others whoſe Fruit, burniſh'd with golden Rind —
>
> Thro' the pure marble Air, his oblique Way. —

Theſe Lines have been condemned, as not ſtrictly Verſe. There is more Harmony, however, in their Verſification, notwithſtanding their Breach of the Couplet Meaſure, than in ten Thouſand others which might be mentioned, wherein that Meaſure is moſt ſcrupulouſly preſerved. That the Shortneſs of the Periods, or Intervals betweeen the natural Pauſes, really form, in a great Degree, poetic Meaſures, is farther evident, from the poetical Turn which we find in all Writings of this Kind, where the Stile is any Degree elevated above the Terms of common Diſcourſe. Thus, it is the quick Succeſſion of a few flowing Syllables that conſtitutes the Harmony of our Engliſh blank Verſe, and not its perfect Coincidence with the arbitrary Rules laid down as a Standard for heroic Verſe.

It

It hath been made ſufficiently apparent, that a Pauſe may be made in any Part of the Line in Blank-Verſe when the Senſe requires it, without Injury to the Verſification. Blank-Verſe, therefore, does not conſiſt in Lines of ten Syllables, as the regular Couplet generally does; unleſs, indeed, we ſuppoſe the Standard of Verſe erected in the Printing-Houſe, and that a Compoſitor can convert Proſe into Verſe at Pleaſure, by printing it in detached Lines of ten Syllables.

The natural Modulation of the Voice in Speaking and Reading, will hardly ever admit, as before obſerved, of our pronouncing ten Syllables without making a Pauſe; but all artificial Pauſes are deſtructive of true Harmony. Hence it is, that every Line of ten or more Syllables muſt be compoſed of more than one poetic Period; call it a Foot, Meaſure, a Verſe, or what we will. Now it would be juſt as abſurd, to ſuppoſe a Verſe to end in the Middle of a Foot or Meaſure, as to ſuppoſe a Sentence to end in the Middle of a Word.

It would be with Propriety, therefore, that Verſes without Rhime were written

and printed of different Lengths, agreeable to their reſpective Pauſes and Meaſures, the Line always ending with a Stop in the Senſe, rather than as they are now printed, with the Senſe running into one another.

At leaſt, I am certain, it would be of great Uſe to common Readers; who are apt to pauſe at the End of a Line in reciting Verſe, whether the Senſe will admit of it or no.

The following Lines, among many Hundred others of the like Nature, in Paradiſe Loſt, may ſerve to illuſtrate what I mean in this Particular.

——— on the eaſtern Cliff of Paradiſe
He lights, and to his proper Shape returns
A Seraph wing'd: Six Wings he wore, to ſhade
His Lineaments divine; the Pair that clad
Each Shoulder broad, came mantling o'er his Breaſt
With regal Ornament; the middle Pair
Girt like a ſtarry Zone his Waiſt, and round
Skirted his Loins and Thighs with downy Gold
And Colours dipt in Heaven; the third his Feet
Shadow'd from either Heel, with feather'd Mail,
Sky-tinctur'd Grain. Like Maia's Son he ſtood
And ſhook his Plumes, that heavenly Fragrance fill'd
The Circuit wide.

I am perſuaded, that the Deſcription contained in the above Lines would appear

pear more obvious to the Generality of Readers, if they were printed in the Manner following; nor do I conceive they would be deprived of any Part of their poetical Beauty.

On the eaſtern Cliff of Paradiſe he lights,
And to his proper Shape returns a Seraph wing'd:
Six Wings he wore, to ſhade his Lineaments divine;
The Pair that clad each Shoulder broad,
Came mantling o'er his Breaſt with regal Ornament;
The middle Pair girt like a ſtarry Zone his Waiſt,
And round ſkirted his Loins and Thighs with downy Gold
And Colours dipt in Heaven.
The third his Feet ſhadow'd from either Heel with feather'd Mail,
Sky tinctur'd Grain.
Like Maia's Son he ſtood and ſhook his Plumes,
That heavenly Fragrance fill'd the Circuit wide.

It is very common to meet with modern Blank-Verſe that would paſs univerſally for Proſe, were it not for the Mode in which it is printed: It is not quite ſo common, on the other hand; to meet with Poetry impoſed on us for Proſe. In a late Tranſlation of *Geſner*'s rural Poems, however, we have an Inſtance of this Nature; which will ſhew the Futility of this mechanical Way of diſtinguiſhing Verſe from

Proſe. The firſt Poem, addreſſed to Daphne, begins thus:

" Not of victorious Chiefs diſtain'd with Blood,
" nor Fields of Carnage ſings the frolic Muſe. Timid
" and gentle, from ſuch horrid Scenes, graſping her
" ſlender Flute, ſhe ſpeeds her Flight."
" Led by the Murmurs of refreſhing Streams, and
" ſilent Shades of ſacred Groves, ſhe ſtrays: Now by
" the Brook, whoſe Banks are lin'd with Reeds; now
" in the Walks, thick ſhaded o'er with Trees; tramp-
" ling the Flowers: Or now, reclining on the moſſy
" Bank, ſhe ſits at Eaſe, and meditates the Song."

Might not the Compoſitor have made Blank-Verſe of this, by printing it in the uſual Form?

Not of victorious Chiefs diſtain'd with Blood,
Nor Fields of Carnage, ſings the frolic Muſe.
Timid and gentle, from ſuch horrid Scenes,
Graſping her ſlender Flute, ſhe ſpeeds her Flight.
Led by the Murmurs of refreſhing Streams,
And ſilent Shades of ſacred Groves, ſhe ſtrays:
Now by the Brook, whoſe Banks are lin'd with Reeds;
Now in the Walks, thick ſhaded o'er with Trees;
Trampling the Flowers: ——
Or now, reclining on the moſſy Bank,
She ſits at Eaſe, and meditates the Song.

Not that I pretend any Innovation in the preſent Modes of Writing and Printing to be either actually expedient or adviſeable; theſe Examples, however, may

ſerve

ſerve to ſhew the Reader, that the allotting a certain Number of Syllables to a Line in Blank-Verſe, is a Practice that contributes very little to its Harmony, and at the ſame Time deprives it, in a great Meaſure, of Propriety, eſpecially where the Pauſes are varied, and the Uniformity of the Couplet-Meaſure rejected.

On the whole, it appears that the Harmony of Engliſh Verſe depends very little, in any Caſe, on its mechanical Diviſion into Lines, conſiſting of a certain Number of Syllables; or even on the alternate Succeſſion of Syllables of different Lengths; the ancient Meaſures being as inapplicable to the Harmony of modern Poetry, as the Mechaniſm of the latter is to poetical Harmony in general. It is, indeed, not eaſy to reduce the Mechaniſm of Engliſh Verſe to ſuch poſitive Rules, as might determine exactly the Number of Syllables to be admitted in a Foot or Meaſure; this Number, as well as the Melody of the Verſe, depending on the Facility with which ſuch Syllables ſucceed each other. Thus the Words of a Greek or Latin Verſe might, in many Caſes, be totally tranſpoſed; yet if the Number and Order of

the Feet remained the ſame, the Verſe might ſtill be ſuppoſed equally good, tho' the Order of the Succeſſion of hard and ſoft, harſh and ſmooth Sounds, ſhould be entirely varied.

In Engliſh, however, the Caſe is different; and Syllables will no more indiſcriminately follow each other in the Compoſition of Metre, even where the Senſe might admit of it, than ſuch Metre will admit of more than a ſmall Number of Syllables. It is not enough, that the Intervals of the Senſe ſhould be *ſhort*, the Words compoſing thoſe Intervals ſhould alſo follow one another ſmoothly and eaſily. In other Words, their Sounds ſhould rather *flow into* than *ſucceed* each other.

We have, indeed, Inſtances of Proſe written in ſo numerous and flowing a Stile, as to paſs for Verſe, were it not for the Length of the Periods or Intervals above-mentioned. Numerous Examples of this Kind are to be met with in *Hervey's Meditations*, and many other florid Performances of the like Nature, that have appeared of late Years.

On the other hand again, the Periods may be ſometimes too ſhort to *flow*; when they

they are as unfit for Verſe, as if they were too long. Examples enough of both, are to be met with, in *Dr. Young's Night Thoughts*, and other declamatory Productions.

Having thus taken a curſory View of the ſeveral Points, moſt worthy the Attention of the Reader, in regard to the mere *vocal* Part of Speech, I ſhall defer the further Illuſtration of their Influence on the Utterance of written Language, till I have ſeparately conſidered the *ſentimental* Part of Speech, or the natural Relations and Connections of Senſe with Sound.

CHAP. III.

Of the ſentimental or ſignificant Part of Speech, with the natural and artificial Relations and Connections of Senſe and Sound.

SECT. I. *Of the general Reſemblance between Senſe and Sound, in Speaking or Reading.*

MUCH hath been advanced, and that by very eminent Writers, in favour of the Reſemblance between Senſe and Sound, or the Art of making the latter an Imitation of the former.

The noble Author, ſo frequently mentioned in the foregoing Pages, makes the following Obſervations on this Subject.

" The only general Rule that can be
" given for directing the Pronunciation,
" is to ſound the Words in ſuch a Manner
" as to imitate the Things they ſignify.
" The Words which make the greateſt
" Figure ought to be expreſſed with a
" peculiar Emphaſis: In expreſſing an
" elevated

" elevated Subject, the Voice ought to be
" raiſed above its ordinary Pitch; and
" Words ſignifying Dejection of Mind,
" ought to be pronounced in a low Note:
" A Succeſſion of Sounds gradually aſcend-
" ing from low to high Notes, repre-
" ſents an aſcending Series of Objects:
" An oppoſite Succeſſion of Sounds, is fit-
" ted for Objects or Sentiments that de-
" ſcend gradually: In Dryden's Ode of
" Alexander's Feaſt, the Line *fal'n, fal'n,*
" *fal'n, fal'n,* ought to be pronounced with
" a falling Voice; and is pronounced in
" that Manner by every one of Taſte,
" without Inſtruction †."

We are farther repeatedly told, by the ſame Writer, a few Lines after, that " the " Art of pronouncing with Propriety and " Grace, being calculated to make the " Sound an Echo to the Senſe, ſcarce ad-" mits of any other general Rule than " that above-mentioned." In Reply, however, to theſe Obſervations, it may be remarked, that the Art of pronouncing with Propriety and Grace, is calculated to much more general and comprehenſive

† See Elements of Criticiſm, Vol. ii. p. 363.

Purpoſes,

Purpoſes, than merely that of making the Sound an Echo to the Senſe. Indeed, the Rule laid down by his Lordſhip (*viz.* to ſound the Words in ſuch a Manner as to imitate the Things they ſignify) is much too vague and indefinite.

There are very few Objects or Affections that bear any Reſemblance to Sounds, nor can therefore be at all imitated in the Pronunciation of the Words expreſſing them. As to the Qualities which they poſſeſs in common with Sound, ſo far indeed they are imitative; as in their Harſhneſs, Smoothneſs, Strength, Weakneſs, Swiftneſs, Slowneſs, *&c.* But even here, it is the *general Senſe* of the Sentence, and not the Meaning of particular Words, which is to guide the Pronunciation in Speaking and in Reading.

Hence, though I agree with this elegant Writer, that "a Period ought to be "pronounced ſlow, when it expreſſes "what is ſolemn and deliberate; and "ought to be pronounced quick, when "it expreſſes any Thing briſk, lively "and impetuous;" yet I cannot by any Means ſubſcribe to his Opinion in the particular Inſtance he adduces.

It

It is, indeed, curious and entertaining enough to ſee a Mime in a Burletta varying his Features, Voice and Attitudes, every Moment at the fantaſtical Changes and Cadences of the Muſic; but in Speaking or Reading, ſuch a quick Variation of Tones would appear ridiculous and affected; as it would render ſuch Oration or Lecture confuſed and unintelligible. That Words of the greateſt Importance in a Sentence, ſhould be uttered with a peculiar Emphaſis, is very certain; but Emphaſis denotes Energy and Force, which are as compatible with a grave as an acute Sound; the loweſt Note in the Gamut being as emphatical as the higheſt.

That an *elevated Subject* ſhould be expreſſed with an *elevated Voice*, may alſo, in ſome Species of Elevation *, be reaſonable enough; but if the Rule ſhould be adopted by which particular *Words*, ſignifying Dejection or Depreſſion, ſhould

* The Term *elevated* is here very equivocal. There are doubtleſs many very ſublime Paſſages, if we regard the Sentiment only, which it might be improper to recite in a high Key. A Period may be very *elevated*, yet very *grave* and *ſolemn*; and therefore very improperly recited in a ſhrill or high Tone of Voice.

be always pronounced in a *low Note*, and *vice verſa*, the Reader might be ſubjected to a greater Variety of Notes than the Singer, without having the Advantage of his Melody; which would make ſtrange Work of mere Recitation. As to the Inſtance given from Alexander's Feaſt, I ſhould like to know whether his Lordſhip would have that Line pronounced thus,

If he would, I may ſafely appeal to any Perſon that hath an Ear, whether the palpable Affectation of ſuch a Method of pronouncing it, would not defeat the Intention of ſuch Imitation.

It is very juſtly obſerved by Mr. Webb *, that the Rule of Criticiſm reſpecting the Sound ſeeming an Echo to the Senſe, " muſt not be underſtood too literally. " The Sound, ſays he, ſhould, indeed, " be always in Accord with the Senſe; " but they ſhould accompany, not mimic " it. As the Movements of a good Dancer

* Remarks on the Beauties of Poetry, Page 52.

" are

" are governed by the Muſic, ſo the " Muſic of the Verſe ſhould be go- " verned by the Idea: But, the Nature of " Language will not admit of a conſtant " Correſpondence." Hence, this Writer calls the Imitation of the Rumbling of Drums, in the following Paſſage from Dryden, altogether ridiculous.

> The double, double, double Beat
> Of the thund'ring Drum
> Cries, Hark! the Foes come.

My Lord Kaims appears to have a much more reſpectable Idea of this Affinity between Senſe and Sound; having quoted a Number of Paſſages from the Poets, in order to manifeſt its Beauty. Certain, however, it is, that it is frequently very fanciful and imaginary. There is a celebrated Paſſage in Pope's Eſſay on Criticiſm, which hath been long quoted and requoted as an happy Inſtance of the Similitude in Queſtion. A very judicious Critic * hath, nevertheleſs, very lately called in Queſtion, and confuted the general Opinion in this Particular; and hath

* Mr. S. Johnſon.

in

in a great Degree verified the Proverb: which, as it is homely and may eaſily ſuggeſt itſelf, need not be repeated.

And yet we find this Point much inſiſted on in the Elements of Criticiſm, and laboured with a mechanical Minuteneſs. I cannot help differing, however, from this Author, with the ingenious Critic laſt mentioned, and think that the Sound of

Flies o'er th' unbending Corn, and ſkims along the Main,

bears no Similitude whatever to Rapidity of Motion, however we may ſuppoſe it *prolonged*. Indeed, the *Prolongation* of a *rapid* Motion is a Kind of contradictory Expreſſion: For though, it be true that a Motion may be actually continued, be its Velocity what it will, yet a ſwift Motion cannot be apparently ſo, without a ſeeming Diminution of its Rapidity.

Again, we conceive the Author of the Elements ſomewhat ſingular in his accounting for the Effects of certain Imitations of this Kind. Thus he tells us, that a long Syllable made ſhort, or a ſhort Syllable made long, raiſes, by the Difficulty of pronouncing contrary to Cuſtom, a Feeling ſimilar to that of hard Labour;

as

as an Inſtance of which, he gives the following Lines of Pope.

When Ajax ſtrives ſome Rocks *vaſt* Weight to throw,
The Line too labours, and the Words move ſlow.

Now I conceive it extremely problematical whether Mr. Pope intended to convey the Senſation here hinted at, in the Word *vaſt* in the firſt Line. But be this as it will, the Liberty he took in making a long Syllable ſhort in this Place, hath hath been frequently imitated by ſucceeding Writers, who were very far from having any ſuch Intention.

Shield me kind Dryads in this ſafe retreat
Where Oſiers mark the *cool* Waves lucid Way. —

What Time on Arrow's oſier'd Bank reclin'd
I to the *pale* Moon pour'd the plaintive Lay. —

Yet not this *cold* Heart can remain unmov'd
When thy ſweet Numbers ſtrike the raptur'd Ear.

It is ſure impoſſible for us to conceive the Author of the above Verſes, deſigned to convey any Senſation ſimilar to that of hard Labour in the poetical Licence here inſtanced; and of which Practice we have numerous Examples, even to a Degree of

Affecta-

Affectation, in the Writings of our modern minor Poets †.

But, though it ſhould not be admitted, that the general Reſemblance between Sound and Signification, is ſo chimerical as I have Reaſon to think it is, I preſume, what hath been already ſaid, is ſufficient to ſhew the Neceſſity of a more certain Rule for directing our Pronunciation, than the above-mentioned vague and indefinite one of imitating the Senſe.

The chief End of Speech is to *inform* the Mind of the Hearer; that of engaging the Ear with fanciful Modes of Sound or Expreſſion, is a ſubordinate one. Propriety is, indeed, ſometimes unattended by Elegance; but Elegance cannot ſubſiſt without Propriety. It would be highly abſurd, therefore, to make the obvious Standard of the one depend on any imaginary Criterion of the other.

† As a Proof of this, the Reader need only turn to the late Elegies of Maſon, Langhorne, and Others.

SECT.

SECT. II. *Of the Difference between ſpoken and written Language, and the true Criterion of ſimple Pronunciation.*

Having rejected the Reſemblance between Senſe and Sound, as a Rule to direct the Pronunciation in Speaking or Reading in general; it will hardly be imagined I ſhould contend for any Similitude between the Sound and Signification of particular Words.

That a fertile Imagination may find ſome faint Traces of ſuch a Connection, among the radical Words of moſt Languages, I will not diſpute; it is ſufficient, however, for the preſent Purpoſe, to ſuppoſe the Meaning annexed to particular Words altogether arbitrary; or rather, that the Sounds adapted to expreſs our Ideas, are purely conventional, and bear no natural Relation, Reſemblance or Affinity whatever to ſuch Ideas, or to the Objects they expreſs.

In the ſame Manner, I ſuppoſe the Types or Marks of written Language to be equally arbitrary, and to have as little natural Relation, Reſemblance or Affinity

to the Ideas or Objects they ſerve to repreſent.

Now the Art of Reading, being in fact the Art of converting *Writing* into *Speech*, the Relation which the *living Voice* bears to the *dead Letter*, becomes a very peculiar Object of the Reader's Attention.

This Relation, again, I conſider to be juſt as arbitrary and conventional as that between articulate Sounds and the Ideas expreſſed by them; or as that between written Types and their correſpondent Ideas and Objects. At leaſt, I know of no operating Cauſe in Nature that originally prevented the Sound adapted to the Letter *a* from being given to the Letter *e*, and *vice verſa*. Nay, it is not only certain that different Nations do not apply the ſame Sounds to the ſame Letters, but that even the ſame People diverſify thoſe Sounds, at different Times, Places and Occaſions. It is hence manifeſt that *Cuſtom* alone is the Criterion of Pronunciation, as far as it regards particular Words, or the adopting of articulate Voices to diſtinct Syllables. Again, of Cuſtoms, that is the moſt acknowledged Standard, which is adopted by the Learned

and

and poliſhed Speakers of any Age or Nation, reſiding in the Metropolis of their reſpective Countries. As it is not my Deſign, however, to treat here of the Pronunciation of any particular Tongue, this Remark may be conſidered as digreſſional.

With regard to the Difference between ſpoken and written Language, it may, nevertheleſs, be not improper to obſerve, that the latter, having greatly the Advantage in Point of Univerſality, every Conceſſion, in diſputable or indifferent Caſes, ſhould be made to it by the former: In order, if poſſible, to effect a Conciliation of the different Dialects and provincial Modes of Utterance, common to all known Languages.

There is another Advantage alſo, which Writing hath over Speaking; and that is, Preciſion. What is ſpoken may be more nervous and affecting, but it is never ſo exact and intelligible as what is written. It is the Province of the *Reader* to unite both theſe Advantages, and give the Energy of the living Voice to the Preciſion of the dead Letter. This is principally effected by a due Obſervation of Emphaſis, or that Management of the Voice,

by which a due Quantity of Sound is given to every Word and Syllable in a Sentence, in Proportion to its Importance and Significancy.

SECT. III. *Of the Nature and Uſe of Emphaſis in general.*

As Modulation, or a Diverſification of Sounds, is neceſſary to intelligible Pronunciation in general, ſo Emphaſis is neceſſary to the intelligible Pronunciation of every Diſcourſe or Sentence in particular; it being poſſible to expreſs very different Meanings by the ſame Words: So that the Preciſion of ſpoken Language is very different from the moſt correct grammatical Conſtruction of written Words.

Hence the great Advantages which living Speech hath over the dead Letter on the one hand, and the Diſadvantages it lies under on the other. Its Advantages are, that we can expreſs much more ſignificantly what we mean, by Speech, than by Writing; its Diſadvantages are, that others may miſrepreſent what is written by artful and fallacious Modes of Repetition. Every Art, however, that may be put

to

to Uſe is ſubject to Abuſe; and it is not the Buſineſs of a Profeſſor, in teaching the former, to anſwer for the Conſequences of the latter.

Next to the Pronunciation of Words, agreeable to the politeſt and beſt Mode of Sound and Accentuation, it behoves the Reader to ſtudy the Uſe of Emphaſis. The firſt is neceſſary to make his Speech in general underſtood by polite Hearers, and the latter to make his Diſcourſe or Lecture underſtood particularly by every one that pays him Attention.

There are, as before obſerved, two capital Points to be regarded in ſpeaking and reading: Theſe are *Propriety* and *Energy*.

In reſpect to the former; the grammatical Conſtruction of the Words made uſe of, is *firſt* to be conſidered, and the Importance of each Word in the Sentence ſpoken: Next to this, the Relation which the Sentence immediately read or ſpoken, bears to the Context or Converſation.

Thus we will ſuppoſe I mean to ſay, *I intend to go to London*. It is plain that as my firſt Conſideration in Writing would be the Order of the Words and the grammatical

Conſtruction of the Sentence; I ſhould not write *I intends to go to London*; or *Intend I to goes to London*: So in ſpeaking or reading that Sentence, I ſhould not ſay thus, *I intend* TO *go* TO *London*. But laying the Streſs on the moſt important Words in the Sentence, indicating the Intention ſpecified, I ſhould ſay *I* INTEND *to* GO *to* LONDON. Again, if nothing had been previouſly ſaid upon the Subject, and conſequently nothing more meant by ſuch Sentence than to indicate my Intention of going to London, the Manner of ſpeaking it would be, as above cited, obvious and ſimple. But if the Converſation had before turned upon my going to *York*, the Antitheſis muſt be marked in the Pronunciation, the Words remaining ſtill the ſame; thus, *I intend to go to* LONDON. Which emphatical Mode of ſpeaking would anſwer the ſame End, as if I had alſo added, *not to York*.

Again, if Mention had been made of ſome other Perſon's going to *London*, and my Intention was thus indicated as a ſimilar one to his own, the Sentence would be pronounced thus, I *intend to go to London*. As much as to ſay *I alſo*, or

I, as

I, as well as you. Farther, if it had been ſaid that the other Perſon was to go to *York*, the Emphaſis would be laid thus, I *intend to go to* LONDON. Thus we ſee that the Connection of one Sentence with the reſt, or the Senſe of the Context, determines the particular Senſe of every Sentence in the Diſcourſe.

This Connection is ſo obvious and important, that almoſt all Writers on this Subject, have looked upon it as the only Circumſtance eſſential to reading and ſpeaking: The ſeparate Senſe of each Sentence, though a primary Conſideration, being overlooked or perverted. It is, however, abſurd to ſuppoſe, that the Influence which one Sentence hath over another by Connection, ſhould totally pervert the natural and obvious Meaning of a Sentence ſeparately conſidered. Yet this is often found to be the Caſe; particularly in the Declamations of our Comedians, who are too ignorant or fantaſtical to attend to the true Meaning of their Author; and in thoſe of many of our popular Preachers, who are fond of wreſting the Words of a Text from its natural and

obvious Meaning, to ſome other farther-fetched and more myſtical.

Again, thoſe Declaimers, who ſtudy Elegance before Propriety, and are for repeating every thing emphatically, as they call it, are perpetually running into this Error, and adapting Meanings to Words, which their natural Conſtruction will by no Means bear. I have heard ſome of theſe would-be Orators read a Paragraph in the News-Papers, with the ſame emphatical Tone and Manner as they would have rehearſed a Speech in Macbeth or Othello: With what Propriety my Readers will judge. I will not deny that a Reader may ſometimes improve on the Senſe of the Writer by emphatical Expreſſion, as a Tranſlator may ſometimes correct and improve his Original; but I would have Readers in general be very cautious of attempting this. The Genius of a Garrick, indeed, may be allowed now and then to break through all Rules, and, as the Poet ſays,

Snatch a Grace beyond the Reach of Art.

It would perhaps be better, however, if he himſelf had not done it too frequently.

quently. In that famous Paſſage from Shakeſpear,

Draw, Archers; draw your Arrows to the head,

It is ſuppoſed the Poet wrote them as above, with a View to the Actor's pauſing after the Word *Archers*. Mr. Garrick, I think, is ſaid to pronounce them thus,

Draw, Archers, draw;—your Arrows to the Head.

Nothing ſurely can be more evident to a Reader of Taſte and Senſibility, than that if the Actor hath here varied from the Poet, he hath done it with great Propriety and Succeſs; the Line, as it firſt ſtands, being exceedingly tame and frigid; whereas in the laſt Method it glows with all that Spirit and Fire, with which the Hero is ſuppoſed to be agitated.

Theſe are Liberties, however, which I ſay again, inferior Geniuſſes muſt not preſume to take; the plain grammatical Conſtruction of each Sentence, being the firſt Thing to be conſidered, in all Kinds of Reading or Speaking whatever; for this, though it may be farther heightened and animated by the Connection of the Sentence with the Context; yet we may be certain, that whenever this Connection treſpaſſes too far on the natural and obvious

Meaning

Meaning of the Words conſidered by themſelves, that Connection is not real, but imaginary.

Now, though Emphaſis is graceful, is elegant, when founded on *Propriety*, nothing can render a Speaker more abſurd and ridiculous than his falling into Errors in this Particular; as, in ſo doing, he does ſtill worſe than render himſelf unintelligible; ſince he either ſpeaks what he does not mean, or miſrepreſents the Meaning of an Author, for want of knowing how to repeat what he hath written.

This Abuſe of Emphaſis is ſo general, that I cannot help giving a remarkable Inſtance or two of it, from the Lectures of a celebrated Profeſſor of Elocution, who lately figured in the Metropolis and Univerſities of Great Britain and Ireland.

Sect. IV. *Of the Abuſe of Emphaſis.*

Mr. Sheridan, in his Lecture on Emphaſis, hath taken ſome Pains to ſet the Clergy right in their Delivery of the Church Service. Unhappily, however, his Inattention to the ſimple Conſtruction of the Paſſages he mentions, and his hunting

ing after hidden Meanings, have led him into as great Errors, as thoſe he endeavours to correct. The Fact, indeed, hath been taken Notice of by the Authors of, the Monthly Review; who have paſſed ſome ſevere Animadverſions on the Profeſſor's Miſtakes: As they do not enter, however, very particularly into the Source of ſuch Errors, and as the Juſtice of their Strictures on this Head has been called in Queſtion by ſome, who poſſibly might not ſee into their Motives of Cenſure, I ſhall endeavour to ſet theſe Miſtakes in a clearer Light, by giving more particular Reaſons why I cannot help ſubſcribing to the Opinion of thoſe ingenious Critics, in their Reprehenſions of Mr. Sheridan's Manner of emphaſizing the Paſſages in Diſpute.

The firſt Paſſage mentioned by the Lecturer, is this: *Enter not into Judgment with thy Servant, O Lord, for in thy Sight ſhall no Man living be juſtified.* Here, ſays Mr. Sheridan, " the Words " *not, Servant, Sight, juſtified,* between " which it is impoſſible to find out any " Connection, or Dependance of one on " the other, are principally marked.

" By

" By theſe falſe Emphaſes, the Mind is " turned wholly from the main Purport " and Drift of the Verſe. Upon hearing " an Emphaſis on the Particle *not*, it " expects quite another Concluſion to " make the Meaning conſiſtent; and in- " ſtead of the Particle *for*, which begins " the latter Part of the Sentence, it would " expect a *but*; as, *Enter* not *into Judgment* " *with thy Servant, O Lord,* but *regard me* " *with an Eye of Mercy.* When it hears the " Emphaſis on *Servant*, it expects another " Concluſion; as, *Enter not into Judgment* " *with thy Servant, O Lord, but enter into* " *Judgment with thoſe who are not thy Ser-* " *vants.* The ſame alſo will be found in " the Emphaſes on the Words *Sight* and " *juſtified.* So that the Sentence will ſeem " to point at ſeveral different Meanings, " and to have no Conſiſtency. But if it " be read in the following Manner, the " Meaning and Connection will be ob- " vious. *Enter not into Judgment with* " *thy Servant O Lord for in thy Sight,* " *ſhall no Man living be juſtified.* Here " we ſee the whole Meaning is obvious, " and that there is a great deal more

" implied,

" implied, than the mere Words could " expreſs, without the Aid of proper Em- " phaſes. *Enter not into Judgment with* " *thy Servant, O Lord*—That is, *enter not,* " *O Lord, into the Severity of Judgment with* " *thy Creature,—For in thy Sight,—which* " *is all-piercing, and can ſpy the ſmalleſt* " *Blemiſh—ſhall no Man living be juſtified* " *—No Man on Earth, no not the beſt ſhall* " *be found perfect, or ſufficiently pure, to* " *ſtand the Examination of the Eye of Purity* " *itſelf.—For in thy Sight ſhall no Man* " *living be juſtified.*"

The Animadverſions of the Reviewers on theſe Remarks of Mr. Sheridan are rather ludicrous than otherwiſe. " To " copy the Lecturer's Manner of Criti- " ciſm, ſay they, might we not aſk him, " if his laying the Emphaſis on the Word " *living* in this Paſſage, does not ſeem to " intimate that *dead* Men may be juſtified " though the *living* ſhall not? Yet this " ſurely cannot be the Senſe of the Paſ- " ſage. The Word *living* is here uſed as " a phraſeological and unmeaning Term; " and had the Verſe ran thus, *For in thy* " *Sight ſhall no Man be juſtified,* the Senſe

" of

" of it would have been the ſame; and " can Mr. Sheridan pretend that the Em- " phaſis, which only, according to him, " gives Senſe and Meaning to the whole " Sentence, ſhould be laid upon a Word " merely expletive?"

This ſevere Manner of criticiſing may poſſibly diſguſt the more candid Reader: It is nevertheleſs certain, that there is a great deal of Truth couched under this ludicrous Severity. If the Reviewer, however, had called the Word *living* an emphatical or energetic Term, rather than a phraſeological *unmeaning* one, he would have been nearer the Truth. It is true, that it does not add any thing but Energy to the Senſe; the Meaning of the Sentence being the ſame, whether it be inſerted or omitted: but it is to be obſerved, that the great Uſe of all phraſeological Expreſſion is Energy; the Term, therefore, is not *unmeaning* or uſeleſs, although nothing can be more abſurd than Mr. Sheridan's laying the Emphaſis upon *living*, when he puts none on the Word *Man*. The Meaning is plain, *no living Man, no Man alive, not any Man whatever*; now though this may be expreſſed, as the Critic

ſays,

ſays, by *no Man*, it would not be expreſſed ſo emphatically.

To expreſs a Thing emphatically, however, we muſt not follow the Rule here practiſed of laying an excluſive Streſs upon the Words introduced to give Energy to the Expreſſion; their Introduction only ſerving to ſtrengthen the Streſs of the Voice laid upon the right Words, and theſe are the ſame whether any ſuch Words be introduced or not. Thus, whether it be ſaid *No Man ſhall be juſtified*, or *No Man living ſhall be juſtified*, the emphatical Words are *no* and *Man*.

Mr. Sheridan is, indeed, as much miſtaken with Regard to *Emphaſis*, as I have already ſhewn him to be with reſpect to *Accent*. Words, he ſays, are ſolely conſtituted, or diſtinguiſhed from mere Collections of Syllables, by *Accent*: in like Manner, he tells us, that it is Emphaſis which only gives Senſe and Meaning to Sentences. But ſuppoſing Emphaſis to be, what he ſeems to think it, viz. a Method of laying a greater Streſs upon ſome Words in a Sentence than on others, nothing is more certain, than that there are ſome Sentences ſo extremely ſimple and unemphatical,

phatical, as to require no Difference whatever in the forcible Pronunciation of the Words. Will it be ſaid, that theſe Sentences have no Meaning?

There is a general Meaning in every Sentence grammatically written or ſpoken, and which muſt always be conſidered antecedent to the particular Meaning given it by Emphaſis; nor can theſe poſſibly be contrary to each other, how particular ſoever may be the Turn which the latter may give to the other. A material Subſtance may be modified into a Variety of Forms; but thoſe Forms muſt be conſiſtent with the Nature of the Subſtance; nor can it with any Propriety be ſaid, that the mere Form of a Thing gives Being and Conſiſtence to it.

If Emphaſis only gives Senſe and Meaning to Sentences, I ſhould be glad to know of what Uſe is grammatical Conſtruction. I rather believe, important as Emphaſis allowedly is to intelligible and elegant Pronunciation, that falſe Concords would be leſs intelligible of the two, if not more inelegant, than falſe Emphaſes.

This being the Caſe; the articulate Pronunciation of every Word in a Sentence

tence is the Baſis of all Speech; and no Streſs or Emphaſis ſhould be laid on any particular Word in any Sentence, without a due Regard to the general Meaning of the whole, and of the juſt Pronunciation of every Word in that Sentence.

It is for want of paying this due Regard to every ſingle Word in a Sentence, that many not inelegant, but precipitate Readers, frequently repeat to others, many Paſſages whoſe Meaning they do not above half underſtand.

Nothing is ſo common as this Way of *half-reading*, eſpecially in the Works of ſuch Authors, as have a ſententious or laconic Mode of Expreſſion.

The next Inſtance Mr. Sheridan gives of the Abuſe of Emphaſis, is in reading the following Paſſage from the firſt Epiſtle of St. John.

" If we *ſay* that we have no *Sin*, we " deceive *ourſelves*, and the Truth is not *in* " us; but if we confeſs our Sins, He is " faithful and juſt to forgive us our *Sins*, " and to cleanſe us from all *Unrighteouſ-* " *neſs*."

This Verſe, we are told, is uſually pronounced as above emphaſized; on which Mr. Sheridan makes the following Obſervations.

" *If we ſay that we have no Sin*—Here, " by laying the ſtrong Emphaſis on the " Word *ſay*, we are led to a wrong Mean- " ing, as if we only ſaid it with our " Lips, but did not think ſo. How then " can the Concluſion follow of deceiving " ourſelves? We may deceive others by " ſaying what is falſe; but it is only by " thinking falſely we can deceive our- " ſelves, which is the true Meaning of " the Words properly pronounced. *If* " *we ſay that we have no Sin, we deceive* " *ourſelves*—That is, *If there be any amongſt* " *us ſo vainly blind to their own Faults, as* " *to imagine they are without Sin, they de-* " *ceive themſelves.* This Sentence is not " an affirmative one, but conditional. It " does not ſay that there are any ſuch " amongſt us, but, *If* there be any ſuch; " and therefore the conditional Particle " *If*, is in this Caſe emphatical."

The Critics above-mentioned have equally cenſured theſe Remarks with thoſe

thoſe on the former Paſſage; they content themſelves, however, with calling them quaint and puerile; and the Reaſons given for removing the Emphaſis from *ſay* to *if* far-fetched and groundleſs.

It is very apparent, indeed, that if Mr. Sheridan hath not miſtaken the Meaning in the Verſe above quoted, he has invented a Blunder, which would require ſome Ingenuity and Sagacity for any body to fall into. It does not at all appear from the Context that St. John had any View to deceiving *others* by a *verbal* Confeſſion of their Sins; nor could any Reader, tolerably verſed in the Engliſh Tongue, be naturally led to the wrong Meaning here pointed out, from the Uſe of the Word *ſay*; that Verb being uſed not only to ſignify oral Utterance, but to allege, relate, or tell in any Manner whatever. Thus, in the following Lines, a Letter is ſuppoſed to *ſay* a Meſſage.

With flying Speed, and ſeeming great Pretence,
Came Meſſenger with Letters which his Meſſage *ſaid.*

Spenſer's Fairy Queen.

Indeed this Uſe of the Word *ſay* is ſo common, that Authorities are entirely needleſs: And that no Reader, who did

not ſeek for latent and ſtudied Meanings, could poſſibly fall into the Error ſuppoſed, will be obvious to every one who will give the preceding Verſes of the Chapter an unprejudiced and impartial Reading. That the Sentence is not affirmative, but conditional, is admitted, and that therefore the Particle *if* ſhould be in a Degree emphatical, is certain; but then it ſhould be in that Degree in which Particles can be emphatical at all; and not ſo as to exclude the Emphaſis which ſhould be laid on the Verb, expreſſing the very Action on which the Condition depends.

Let us ſuppoſe the Word *allege* made uſe of inſtead of *ſay*, which might have been done with great Propriety.

We ſhould then read *If we allege that we have no Sin:* This is the Condition, *alleging we are without Sin.* Now can it be reaſonably pretended that any Emphaſis placed on the Particle *if*, which connects this conditional Part of the Sentence with the ſubſequent affirmative Part, renders it unneceſſary to lay a Streſs on the Terms expreſſing the Condition itſelf? Surely not! When Mr. Sheridan, therefore, reads that Sentence thus, "If we

ſay

" ſay that we have *no Sin*, we deceive *our-*
" *ſelves*," he is undoubtedly egregiouſly miſtaken.

This Miſtake alſo is evidently owing to the above-mentioned Cauſe, his Neglect to take in the Importance of the ſeveral Words as they ſtand in the grammatical Conſtruction of the Sentence.

For my own Part, I cannot eaſily form a Sentence in which the Particle *if* can require any very conſiderable Degree of Emphaſis, unleſs the Terms of the Condition are underſtood and not expreſſed; where it ſtands alone to form a Sentence of itſelf.

Mr. Sheridan falls into a ſimilar Error, with reſpect to the Particle *but*, in the Beginning of the next Verſe. I ſhall give the Reader his whole Remarks, however, on this Paſſage.

" If *we ſay that we have no* Sin, *we*
" *deceive ourſelves—and the Truth is not* in
" *us*. Here is another Fault committed in
" laying the Emphaſis on the Words *in*
" us only, whilſt the Word *Truth*, which
" is the important one, is ſlightly paſſed
" over. And the *Truth* is not *in* us. That

" is, the Opinion entertained of ourſelves
" is falſe. This ſtrong Emphaſis laid
" only on the Words *in* us, is the more
" unpardonable in thoſe who lay ſuch an
" Emphaſis on the Word *ſay*, becauſe it
" by no means follows that the Truth is
" not in us, becauſe we ſay otherwiſe;
" a Man may think the Truth, and ſay
" the contrary; and this very Phraſe
" proves the Meaning of the Text as
" before explained, that it relates to
" thinking, not ſaying; as it expreſly
" *ſays* * the *Truth* is not *in* us, that is, we
" *think* falſely."

" But if we confeſs our *Sins*—Here
" again the falſe Emphaſis is laid on the
" Word *Sins*, whilſt the principal Cir-
" cumſtance, that of *confeſſing* our Sins,
" is ſlightly paſſed over. But if we *confeſs*
" our Sins,—that is, if upon a thorough
" Self-Examination, after having diſco-
" vered our Sins, we make an humble
" Acknowlegement of them, with a con-

* Is it not very exoraordinary that this Writer ſhould ſo ſtrongly inſiſt that *ſaying* here is ſo liable to be underſtood in its ſtricteſt Senſe, as of ſomething ſaid with the Lips, when he himſelf makes Uſe of it in a figurative Senſe, even in the Illuſtration of his Argument?

" trite

" trite Heart, filled with Penitence, and " a thorough Deſire and Intention of per- " forming; (for all this is implied in the " Word *confeſs*, as no other Sort of Con- " feſſion can be of Avail towards obtain- " ing the conſequential Grace promiſed " from it.) How emphatical, therefore, " ought this Word to be which implies " ſo much!"

Undoubtedly the Word *confeſſed* ought to be very emphatically pronounced; but then I cannot help joining Iſſue again with the Reviewers, that a ſimilar Motive ſhould have induced him to lay a ſtrong Emphaſis on the Verb *ſay* in the firſt Part of the Sentence. For to *ſay* we have no *Sin*, is to *deny* that we have *Sin*, and this *denying* in the firſt Part of the Sentence, is immediately oppoſed to *confeſſing* in the latter, and ſhould certainly be pronounced emphatically to mark the Antitheſis.

Again, the very ſame Reaſon which ſhould induce Mr. Sheridan to place an Emphaſis on *if* in the firſt Part of the Sentence, ſhould, as the Reviewers very juſtly obſerve, have induced him to place a ſimilar one on the ſame Particle in the

ſecond Part, as it is equally emphatical in both.

" There is another Word in this Sen-
" tence, continues Mr. Sheridan, which
" is hurried over, as if it were a mere Par-
" ticle, when in this Place it is a Word of
" ſtrong Import; I mean the Word *but*.
" It is uſually read,—Bŭt if we confeſs our
" Sins,—as if it were a mere disjunctive
" Particle. Whereas *but* in this Situation
" ſtands in the Place of the Words, *On*
" *the other Hand*, as may be ſeen by
" reading the two Members of the Sen-
" tence, and uniting them by theſe
" Words."—*But*, therefore, we are told, ſtanding in the Place of Words, ſhould be made emphatical, as all Particles are when they are ſubſtituted in the Place of Words.

Not, however, more emphatical, I ſhould think, than the Words for which they are ſubſtituted. Let us change the Particle for the Words then, and ſee what Emphaſis could, with any Propriety, be here placed on them, and of what *ſtrong Import* they are in the Sentence. I do not ſee that, *on the other hand*, any more than *but*, is any thing elſe than the mere *formal* Part of the Antitheſis. The Meaning of the

the Sentence would be exactly the ſame, if both were omitted; the whole Deſign of the Writer being to ſay that, *If we deny our Sins, we deceive ourſelves, and if we confeſs our Sins, they will be forgiven us.* So that though a Conjuction copulative might not have been ſo elegant and oratorical as a disjunctive one, it is evidently as important *.

Again, it is obſervable that while Mr. Sheridan is ſo very earneſt about the Conſequence of his *ifs* and *buts*, he forgets to lay an Emphaſis on the Word *deceive*, an important Word undoubtedly, as it expreſſes the Action conſequential on the conditional one.

As to what is alleged, by the way, concerning the Nature of the Confeſſion, it is entirely foreign to the Purpoſe of enforcing the Emphaſis. Of the ſame Nature is the Remark immediately following; wherein the Lecturer recommends a mere declamatory Artifice, calculated rather for the Admiration of the ignorant Vulgar,

* Agreeable to this, we find no *but* in the common Tranſlations of the Bible; nor is there any ſuch Particle in the Original; the five laſt Verſes of the Chapter all beginning with Ἐὰν, *ſi, if.*

than

than Auditors capable of diſtinguiſhing what is delivered with Elegance and Propriety. To proceed with my Quotation.

" *But*, if we confeſs our *Sins*, Hĕ is " faithful and juſt to forgive us our Sins.— " Who is faithful and juſt to forgive us " our Sins? Could any one conceive that " it is the great God of the Univerſe, " who is here ſpoken of in ſo ſlight a " Way. Throughout the whole Service " indeed the awful Name of God is " treated of ſo familiarly, and ſo little " diſtinguiſhed even from any Particle of " three Letters, as muſt give great Of- " fence to pious Ears. It is ſaid of the " great Robert Boyle, that he never men- " tioned the Name of God, even in pri- " vate Diſcourſe, without making a per- " ceptible Pauſe after it. How much " more would this Practice become thoſe " who are engaged in the ſolemn Act of " Public Worſhip? and how much would " it add to the Solemnity of that Wor- " ſhip? In this particular Text, ſome " peculiar Manner of diſtinguiſhing the " Relative, which ſtands for the Name " of God, is more eſſentially neceſſary, " becauſe his Name was not before men-

tioned,

" tioned, and the Sentence can not even
" be made Senſe without it. The Pro-
" noun *He* ſhould therefore be made
" very emphatical, and both be preceded
" and ſucceeded by a perceptible Pauſe;
" at the ſame time the Eyes ſhould be
" devoutly raiſed towards Heaven, to ex-
" plain and enforce by the Look, what is
" deficient in the Expreſſion."

I will not take upon me to ſay, there are no Clergymen who recite the Paſſages in Queſtion, as Mr. Sheridan aſſerts, or that the Service of the Church is always performed with that Decency and Solemnity the Nature of it requires. I would alſo be very far from turning into Ridicule any Cuſtom or Habit ariſing from ſo good a Motive, as a Veneration for the ſacred Name of our Creator; and ſtill much leſs the Example of ſo great and good a Character as Mr. Boyle; and yet, I cannot ſubſcribe to the Propriety of the Pauſes recommended by the Writer; or look upon them in any other Light than as mere declamatorial Tricks, Clap-Traps for the Multitude, which might be practiſed perhaps with Succeſs, on the Stage or at the Tabernacle, but would be altogether

ther too artificial for the Pulpit in our Churches. I can readily conceive that an Auditor of Taſte and Judgment would be almoſt as much pleaſed to ſee a Preacher croſs himſelf, as the Papiſts do, or make a Bow or a Scrape like Catechiſts in a Country Church, as ſtop with ſuch affected Pauſes every Time he might have Occaſion to mention the Name of God.

With Regard to the particular Paſſage in Queſtion; one is apt to imagine the Lecturer really had not ſo much as looked at the Context; ſince he recommends this Method of diſtinguiſhing the Pronoun Relative *He*, becauſe the Name of God was not before mentioned. Whereas it was mentioned but a very few Lines before, and the grammatical Conſtruction preſerved by the Repetition of Pronouns Perſonal or Relative, to the very End of the Chapter *.

But

* John, Chap I.

V. 5. This then is the Meſſage which we have heard of him, and declare unto you, that God is Light, and in *him* is no Darkneſs at all.

6. If we *ſay* that we have Fellowſhip with *him* and walk in Darkneſs, we lie, and do not the Truth:

7. But

But I fear the Patience of my Reader will be exhauſted by my dwelling ſo long on this Inſtance: He will, I preſume, readily admit, however, that the Errors of a Public Profeſſor of any Art, as they are more conſpicuous and important than thoſe of private Individuals, cannot be too explicitly treated. When Pilots and experienced Navigators are miſtaken in their Reckoning, their Blunders ought to be particularly pointed out as a Warning to others, to proceed with greater Attention, or on more certain Principles.

Mr. Sheridan's Miſapprehenſion, with Regard to the Importance of Particles, leads him into ſtill greater Errors than the preceding. "Particles, ſays he, when-
"ever they are emphatical, change the
"Meaning of the Words from that which
"belongs to them as pronounced in the
"common Way. Thus if we read this

7. But if we walk in the Light, as *he* is in the Light, we have Fellowſhip one with another, and the Blood of Jeſus Chriſt *his Son* cleanſeth us from all Sin.

8. If we *ſay* that we have no Sin, we deceive ourſelves, and the Truth is not in us.

9. If we confeſs our Sins, *he* is faithful and juſt to forgive us our Sins, and to cleanſe us from all Unrighteouſneſs.

Line

" Line of Othello in the following
" Manner,

Put out the Light, and then, put out the Light;

" It is Nonſenſe. But by marking the
" Particle *thè* in the Repetition of the
" ſame Words, a new Idea and a new
" Meaning is preſented to the Mind.

Put out the Light, and then put out *the* Light.

" That is, the Light of Life, put in Op-
" poſition, by Force of this Emphaſis, to
" the Light of the Candle."

In remarking on this pretended Correction, I ſhall beg Leave to make Uſe of the Words of the Monthly Critics beforementioned, as my Opinion is ſo perfectly conformable to theirs in this Particular. This Obſervation, ſay they, " is extreme-
" ly puerile, and had come with greater
" Propriety from an illiterate Member of
" the *Spouting Club*, than from a cele-
" brated Profeſſor of Elocution. To the
" beſt of our Remembrance, we have
" heard Mr. Quin do Juſtice to Shake-
" ſpeare in that Paſſage by reciting it
" thus;

Put out the Light, and then,—put out the Light!

To

" To ſuppoſe, with Mr. Sheridan, that " the Alluſion between the Light of the " Candle and that of Life, preſented itſelf " to the Mind of Othello before he began " the Line, is to ſuppoſe his Mind ſuffi- " ciently calm and unembarraſſed to talk " in Metaphor and Conceit; whereas it " is not ſo unnatural for that Alluſion to " ſtrike him after he had mentioned put- " ting out the Candle; in which Caſe no- " thing can be more natural than for him " to pauſe, and repeating his Words, by " way of recollecting what he ſaid, to " addreſs the Taper in the moralizing " Strain that follows,

If I quench thee, thou flaming Miniſter,
I can again thy former Light reſtore
Should I repent. But once quench *thy* Light,
Thou cunning'ſt Pattern of excelling Nature!
I know not where is that Promethean Heat
That can thy Light relumine."

The next Inſtance of this Kind relates to the Particle *and*, and is taken from the following Lines in Tamerlane,

Can'ſt thou believe thy Prophet, or what's more,
That Power Supreme that made *thee* AND thy Prophet.

Under this Emphaſis the Particle *and*, ſays Mr. Sheridan, is couched the following

ing Meaning, "This Prophet whom thou "worſhippeſt, and to whom thou payeſt "chief Honours, was only a Creature like "thyſelf, made by the ſame Almighty "Being, and ſubject to the ſame Laws."

Now, though this Meaning may, with ſome Stretch of Thought, be deduced from the Emphaſis being laid on the Particle *and*; yet it does by no Means appear that any ſuch Thing was intended to be ſaid. On the contrary, I am perſuaded, that the Poet would have beſtowed more Words on the Matter, if he had deſigned to ſay as much, and would not have left it to be gathered ſolely from the Actor's placing an artful Emphaſis on a Particle.

If we examine, indeed, into the obvious and ſimple Meaning of the Words, it does not appear that we can deduce any thing of this depreciating Quality, between Mahomet and the Perſon addreſſed, as is ſuppoſed to be obliquely hinted at, *Canſt thou believe thy Prophet, or what's more*, certainly it was not depreciating the Prophet to ſay that God Almighty was more or greater: nor was it putting the Man and the Prophet upon an equal Footing

ing to call God, *That Power ſupreme that made them both.*

We can conceive ſpiritual Beings of a much ſuperior Nature to ourſelves, as Angels, &c. all made by the ſame Creator with ourſelves, and yet not the ſame Kind of Creatures, nor ſubject to the ſame Laws.

The Perſon ſpoken to, is not directly cenſured for believing in his Prophet; on the contrary, that Prophet is ſpoken of with a Degree of Reſpect, though infinitely beneath that paid to the Deity, which is exalted as the Author or Creator even of the Prophet as well as of the Man.

On this Circumſtance then lies the Streſs or emphatical Part of the Sentence. So that, inſtead of laying the Emphaſis ſolely on the Particle *and*, it ſhould be laid chiefly on the Word *made*, as expreſſive of that Action, Quality, or creative Power, in which the Superiority mentioned conſiſts: For *and*, hath at beſt no other Meaning than *alſo*, or, *as well as*; this is plain by reading the Lines thus,

Can'ſt thou believe thy Prophet, or what's more,
That Power Supreme that made thee with thy Prophet *alſo*;
Or, *Thy* Prophet *as well as thee.*

The Importance of the Particle *and* will totally vaniſh, and the latent Senſe, ſuppoſed to be couched under it, appear altogether chimerical, if we diverſify the Words thus,

> Can'ſt thou believe thy Prophet, or what's more,
> That Power Supreme, which is both thy *Maker* and thy *Prophet*'s.

I believe I may venture to ſay, that this and this only, was the Meaning of the Poet; at leaſt this is all the Words will bear, in their obvious and natural Senſe; beyond which, every Kind of Meaning, however certainly intended, had better be ſunk, as it will appear at beſt quaint, affected and obſcure.

We have a remarkable Inſtance of this in the laſt Lines of the celebrated Epitaph of Mr. Pope, on Mr. Gay.

> —— *The Virtuous and the Good ſhall ſay,*
> *Striking their penſive Boſoms—Here lies Gay.*

Mr. Pope is ſaid to have complained, that few Perſons entered into the Conceit of Gay's lying interred in the Boſoms of the Good and Virtuous. And yet the Epitaph was admired; at leaſt much more than it hath been ſince his learned Commentator

mentator informed the World of the reality of this Conceit's being intended.

In this Place there was undoubtedly an Impropriety in the Quaintneſs of the Turn; which was by no Means adapted to the ſolemn Nature of that Species of Writing, the Epitaph. In an Epigram it would have had Propriety. Suppoſing no Impropriety, however, in the Caſe, the Uſe of Emphaſis will always degenerate into Abuſe, if the Reader is anxious, as Mr. Sheridan ſeems to be, of giving to Words all the Meaning they ſeem capable of ſupporting, or that they may be wreſted into.

Eaſe and Simplicity are the chief Requiſites in every Art, and particularly in Stile and Diction; thus Sentences may be ſometimes overcharged with Meaning, as well as be too void of it; and a Reader ſhould ever be cautious of making his Author ſay *more* than he intended, leſt he ſhould pervert his real Intention, and make him ſay what he never intended at all.

It were paying a very bad Compliment to a good Writer, to ſuppoſe he wrote enigmatically, or that it required Labour

and Ingenuity to decipher what he addreſſed to the common Underſtandings of Mankind.

Again, it is not uncommon for Writers, who pique themſelves on a flowing Stile, or what is called numerous Compoſition, to make Uſe of Words, which, with regard to the Senſe, are merely expletive; ſerving no other Purpoſe than to harmonize the Periods, and give Meaſure and Rotundity to the Sentence.

It is extremely idle for the Reader, in ſuch Caſes, to load the Words thus uſed with an Emphaſis, as if they were ſtrongly ſignificant.

In pronouncing the following Line in *Othello*, Mr. Sheridan ſays, "The peçuliar "Beauty and Force *is* loſt, by laying the "Emphaſis on the Verb *love*, inſtead of "laying it on the auxiliary Verb *do*.

Perdition catch my Soul but I do love *thee:*

"Whereas when it is repeated

Perdition catch my Soul but I dò *love thee*—

"the Emphaſis on *dò*, marks the Vehe-"mence of his Affection, much better "than any Emphaſis on the Verb *love* "could. For when the Emphaſis is laid

"on

" on the Verb *love*, *do* becomes a mere " Expletive, being an unneceſſary Sign of " the Preſent Tenſe. But when an Em- " phaſis is placed on *do*, it becomes an " Auxiliary Verb, ſignifying an Act of " the ſtrongeſt Affirmation."

It is very certain that, as to the Senſe of the Line, the Verb *do* is in the former Caſe merely expletive; but it is not ſo with Regard to the Meaſure of the Verſe, nor to the Rotundity of the Expreſſion: for how would the Line have run, if written thus,

Perdition catch my Soul but I love *thee?*

It is to be conſidered, therefore, whether the Senſe be full and compleat without laying any Emphaſis on the expletive; and if ſo, ſuch Emphaſis is falſe and needleſs, as in the preſent Caſe; Othello being made, according to Mr. Sheridan's Manner of Reading, to talk in the infantine Strain of Nurſes and young Children *.

To

* The Monthly Reviewers, ſpeaking of this Paſſage, agree, indeed, with Mr. Sheridan, that an Emphaſis ſhould be laid on *do*; but not that it ſhould therefore be quite taken away from *love*: The Auxiliary Verb, ſay they

To dwell no longer, however, on the imaginary Importance of *ifs*, *buts*, and *ands*, or on the Abſurdity of laying a Streſs on *Auxiliary* Verbs, to the Excluſion of the *Principal*, we find our Declaimers guilty of as great an Abuſe of Emphaſis, though a more excuſable one, in the extraordinary Streſs they are accuſtomed to lay upon *Epithets*, to the Neglect of the *Noun Subſtantives* they accompany; juſt as if the Words importing the Properties or Qualities of Things were of more Importance than thoſe expreſſive of the Things themſeves. Thus, if in ſaying *I ſold an* HORSE *To-day*, I ſhould clap an additional Piece of Information to the Sentence by Means of the Epithet *black*;

they, hath no Meaning without the Principal had been before mentioned, and were here only underſtood; which is not the Caſe. Theatrical Declaimers (continue theſe Critics) ſeem not to be ſufficiently aware that the Emphaſis is frequently required to be continued, with a little Variation, on two, and ſometimes three Words together. They might have given a ſtriking Example of this from the Speech of Satan in the fifth Book of Milton's Paradiſe Loſt.

—— *New* Laws thou ſeeſt *impos'd*,
New LAWS from HIM who REIGNS *new* MINDS may raiſe
In US who SERVE, *new* COUNSELS to debate
What *doubtful* may *enſue*.

to

to ſpeak after the vicious Mode of emphaſizing, I ſhould lay the Streſs upon the Word expreſſive of the Quality of the Horſe, excluſive of the Horſe itſelf; thus, *I ſold a* BLACK *Horſe To-day*; as if it had been previouſly affirmed that I had ſold a *white* one.

Whoever is attentive to the Mode of Pronunciation on our Theatres, will find this to be very frequently the Caſe. Nay, I remember to have heard one of the beſt Speakers in England, and who is generally accounted to read Milton's Paradiſe Loſt in particular better than any other Man in the three Kingdoms, guilty of this Error in reciting the following Paſſage; which he pronounced thus,

—— Sage he ſtood
With ATLANTEAN Shoulders fit to bear
The Weight of MIGHTIEST Monarchies.

Laying a ſtrong Emphaſis on the Epithets *Atlantean* and *mightieſt*, and ſinking the Subſtantives *Shoulders* and *Monarchies*, as if they were merely expletive and inſignificant. That both theſe Epithets are ſtrongly emphatical is very certain; but, unleſs there is ſome Antitheſis in view, or

the Subſtantive hath been before mentioned, no Epithet can be emphatical independent of its Subſtantive. The Senſe, indeed, will determine how far the one may be more or leſs ſo than the other; as in the Inſtance before us, where the particular Alluſion intended by the Epithet *Atlantean*, and the general Meaning of the Subſtantive *Shoulders*, ſhew, that the Streſs to be laid on the former ſhould be greater than that on the latter. On the other hand, in the laſt Line, it is equally clear that the Senſe requires a greater Streſs to be laid on *Monarchies* than on *mightieſt*; the Word Monarchies evidently referring to the ſame Alluſion of Atlas's ſupporting the World.

Thus the Senſe and Meaning of this Paſſage plainly requires it to be recited thus,

Sage he ſtood
With ATLANTEAN *Shoulders* fit to bear
The Weight of *mightieſt* MONARCHIES.

An Error of the ſame Kind is that, of laying a Streſs upon Adverbs, and upon Adjectives uſed adverbially, to the Neglect of the Verbs on which they depend; as

as if the Mode of an Action were of more Importance than the Action itſelf. Thus in ſaying *he wept bitterly, ſhe ſung ſweetly, it ſlept profound*, theſe miſtaken Declaimers would lay the Emphaſis ſolely on the Adverbs and the Adjective; whereas it ſhould be laid alſo, and that principally, on the Verb. There are Caſes indeed wherein the Verb is uſed metaphorically, and does not ſtrictly expreſs an Action in that literal Senſe in which it is generally uſed. Here the greater Streſs ſhould not be laid on the Verb, but on the Adverb. Thus in the following Sentence, *Should a Man ſit down to write on ſuch a Subject*, the Verb *ſit* does not ſtrictly mean the corporal Act of *ſitting*, in Oppoſition to ſtanding or lying, but the taking up ſome time, or the attentive Application to write; and thence the Streſs ſhould be rather laid upon the Adverb *down*, than on the Verb *ſit*.

Again, in the Line laſt quoted from Milton,

Sage he ſtood,

The Emphaſis ſhould be rather laid upon *ſage* than upon *ſtood*; for though it be true, that Beelzebub is repreſented in a ſtanding

ſtanding Poſture, yet it is not in that particular Poſition his Capacity to bear the Weight of Monarchies is ſuppoſed to depend; but on his mental Strength or Sagacity; as fully appears from the Lines preceding;

> With grave
> Aſpect he roſe, and in his riſing ſeem'd
> A Pillar of State; deep on his Front engraven
> Deliberation ſat and public Care;
> And princely Counſel in his Face yet ſhone,
> Majeſtic though in Ruin: Sage he ſtood, &c.

The Reader will ſee clearly, from theſe Examples, that nothing leſs than a perfect Acquaintance with the Meaning of an Author, can enable any Perſon to read his Works with Energy and Propriety; the Errors committed by artificial Declaimers being very groſs, and of much more Conſequence than thoſe of Readers who affect no emphatical Mode of Delivery at all.

If the latter diſguſt, they ſeldom miſlead; the Purpoſes of Speaking and Reading alſo would be even better anſwered by the barely-intelligible Delivery of the Senſe of the Writer, than by a declamatory Mode of Recital, by which his

his Meaning would be obſcured or perverted. The Information of the Mind, and Improvement of the Underſtanding, is of more Conſequence than pleaſing the Ear; and though it may be ſaid the latter is neceſſary to awaken Attention, it is better perhaps ſuch Attention ſhould remain aſleep, than be awakened by thoſe Means which may ſerve to miſlead the Judgment.

One might be led to imagine, by the extravagant Manner in which the Importance of Emphaſis is treated by ſome Writers *, that written Language had really no determinate Meaning at all; but that all depended upon the oral Utterance of the Reader: I ſhall endeavour to ſhew, however, that the Influence of Emphaſis, great as it is, is ſtill ſubject to the Preciſion of written Language, and that if Orthography and Syntax do not accompany the Reader's Orthoëpy and Emphaſis, his Oratory will have no more Effect than the ſounding Braſs and the tinkling Cymbol.

* See Sheridan's Lectures.

SECT. V. *Of Pauſe, Cadence, Tone, and Geſture.*

Pauſes, in Speaking and Reading, are equally neceſſary both to Grace and Propriety. Their Uſe is too obvious in both Caſes to need much Explanation. Rhetoricians, however, have been greatly perplexed about their Nature and Application. The Abbé Batteux obſerves, that from the Neceſſity we lie under of frequently fetching Breath, we firſt begin to perceive the Uſe and Expediency of Pauſes in Diſcourſe.

But beſides this Reaſon for pauſing, which may be called a Motive of Neceſſity, he remarks, that there are three other Kinds of Pauſes, equally uſeful both to the Speaker and Hearer.

As to the Objects of a Diſcourſe, he ſays, "they ſhould be all repreſented "diſtinct and without Confuſion; and "conſequently require to be ſeparated by "ſome Kind of Interval. Let us conſi-"der them as they are found in Nature, "or in a Picture; not one but has its "Line of Circumſcription, which bounds

"it

" it and ſeparates it from every other Ob-
" ject. And is it to be imagined, that in a
" Diſcourſe, which is a moving Picture
" coloured in the moſt exact and regular
" Manner, they ought not be be drawn
" ſeparately, and diſtinguiſhed from each
" other in the ſame Manner as in a Piece
" of Painting?

" Though the Pauſe of the Objects re-
" preſented is very eaſily confounded with
" that of the Mind which repreſents
" them, and this without Danger of
" prejudicing the Number of the Diſ-
" courſe, nevertheleſs the Mind has its
" Pauſe peculiar to itſelf, and quite
" diſtinct from that of the Object.

" Like a Painter, it draws its Strokes
" one after another, whence they muſt
" neceſſarily be ſeparated from one another
" by ſome Kind of Space or Interval.
" There are three Operations of the
" Mind; Idea, Judgment, and Reaſon-
" ing. Each of theſe is terminated by a
" Pauſe. When the Mind confines itſelf
" to an Idea, there is a Pauſe after this
" Idea. When it would form a Judg-
" ment, there is likewiſe a Pauſe after
" this Judgment. Laſtly, there is ano-
" ther

" ther Pauſe after the Reaſoning. Be-
" ſides this, the Judgment when com-
" plex, and every Reaſoning in general
" has its half Pauſes and Quarter-Pauſes,
" which are diſtinguiſhed by the Punc-
" tuation: for Example: *Youth, Beauty,*
" *and Riches, are periſhable Goods.*

" The Ear has alſo its Pauſes, which
" occur after a certain Space of Time, and
" are as ſo many Points, terminating a
" certain Succeſſion of Times, and mark-
" ing the Inſtant of Commencement of
" another Succeſſion. Theſe Pauſes are
" very evident in Muſic, which is always
" diſtributed by Phraſes, Demi-Phraſes,
" and Meaſures. A Succeſſion of Sounds,
" without their proper Diviſions and
" Compartments, would quickly tire the
" Ear, or at leaſt ceaſe to afford it any
" Exerciſe. *Numerus in continuatione*
" *nullus eſt.*

" A few Examples will preſently ex-
" plain all that has been ſaid. *This young*
" *Plant, thus watered with the Dews of*
" *Heaven, was not long without bringing*
" *forth Fruit.* In this Phraſe there is but
" one Pauſe marked, which is that where
" the full Stop is. Nevertheleſs there is

a Pauſe

" a Pauſe after *Plant*, another after
" *Heaven*, and another after *long*. And
" to pronounce it properly, there ſhould
" be ſome Space or Diviſion obſerved.
" We may breathe after *Heaven*, but then
" this is but an half Pauſe, the Mind not
" being at the End or Boundary of its
" Operation till after *Fruit*. There is a
" Pauſe for the Object after *Plant*, and
" another after *long*; there is one for the
" Reſpiration after *Heaven*, and, laſtly,
" another for the Mind after *Fruit*. The
" Pauſe of the Object, and that of the
" Reſpiration, are blended together in that
" of the Mind, which ſtill continues its
" Progreſs, though the Objects are di-
" vided, and the Pronunciation ſtops
" to give breathing Time: this occaſions
" a Variety. At length theſe three
" Pauſes all fall into one another at the
" full Stop, where the Succeſſion of Ob-
" jects finiſhes, the Reſpiration remains
" free, and the Mind is at the End of its
" Career."

As to the Pauſes of the Ear, the Abbé obſerves, that they depend either on Rhime, as in modern Verſe, or in the Obſervance

Obſervance of harmonious Intervals, as in numerous Proſe.

In regard to the Diſtance at which theſe Pauſes are to be placed, he ſays, that in Poetry it is to be determined inconteſtibly according to the Neceſſity of Reſpiration and the Laws of Taſte. And that in Proſe we ought to follow the ſame Rules. This, it is true, is cutting the Matter very ſhort; but with regard to myſelf, I cannot help thinking that a good Speaker would chuſe to have always ſome more graceful Motive, at leaſt apparently, for pauſing, than a Neceſſity of fetching Breath. For this, however indiſpenſible, ſhould be made to coincide, if poſſible, with ſome other Motive. And as to referring the Reciter of Poetry to the Laws of Taſte; however inconteſtible may be their Deciſion, we are not the leſs at a Loſs to know where that Criterion is to be found.

My Lord Kaims follows the Abbé in a great Meaſure, in his Diſtinction of the Pauſes; dividing them in the ſame Manner, into Pauſes and Semi-Pauſes, with much apparent Accuracy. But I cannot help thinking that much of what hath been

been advanced on this Head, is futile and frivolous: His Lordſhip, indeed, hath entered very ingeniouſly into an Enquiry what Words may be ſeparated by a Pauſe, and what are incapable of ſuch a Separation.

My Readers will be obliged to me for ſubſtituting his Lordſhip's Remarks, inſtead of what I might offer to the ſame Purpoſe, on this curious Subject.

The firſt verbal Relation that preſents itſelf, ſays his Lordſhip, "is that of Adjective and Subſtantive, being the Relation of Subſtance and Quality, the moſt intimate of all: and with reſpect to ſuch intimate Companions, the Queſtion is, Whether they can bear to be ſeparated by a Pauſe? What occurs is, that a Quality cannot exiſt independent of a Subſtance, nor is it ſeparable from it even in Imagination, becauſe they make Parts of the ſame Idea; and for that Reaſon, with reſpect to Melody as well as Senſe, it muſt be diſagreeable to beſtow upon the Adjective a Sort of independent Exiſtence, by interjecting a Pauſe betwixt it and its Subſtantive. I cannot

" therefore approve the following Lines,
" nor any of the Sort; for to my Taſte
" they are harſh and unpleaſant.

Of Thouſand bright || Innhabitants of Air——
The Sprites of fiery || Termagants inflame——
The reſt, his many-colour'd || Robe conceal'd——
The ſame, his ancient || perſonage to deck——
Ev'n here, where frozen || Chaſtity retires——
I ſit, with ſad || Civility, I read——
Back to my native || Moderation ſlide——
Or ſhall we ev'ry || Decency confound, &c.——

" Conſidering this Matter in a ſuper-
" ficial View, one might be apt to ima-
" gine, that it muſt be the ſame, whether
" the Adjective go firſt, which is the na-
" tural Order, or the Subſtantive, which
" is indulged by the Laws of Inverſion.
" But we ſoon diſcover this to be a Miſ-
" take: Colour, for Example, cannot
" be conceived independent of the Sur-
" face coloured; but a Tree may be con-
" ceived, as growing in a certain Spot,
" as of a certain Kind, and as ſpreading
" its extended Branches all around, with-
" out ever thinking of its Colour. In a
" Word, a Subject may be conſidered

" with

" with ſome of its Qualities independent
" of others; though we cannot form an
" Image of any ſingle Quality indepen-
" dent of the Subject. Thus then,
" though an Adjective named firſt be
" inſeparable from the Subſtantive, the
" Propoſition does not reciprocate: An
" Image can be formed of the Subſtan-
" tive independent of the Adjective;
" and for that Reaſon, they may be ſepa-
" rated by a Pauſe, when the former is
" introduced before the latter:

For thee, the Fates || ſeverely kind ordain——
And curs'd with Hearts || unknowing how to yield——

" The Verb and Adverb are preciſely
" in the ſame Condition with the Sub-
" ſtantive and Adjective. An Adverb,
" which expreſſes a certain Modification
" of the Action expreſſed by the Verb,
" is not ſeparable from it even in Imagi-
" nation; and therefore I muſt alſo give
" up the following Lines,

And which it much || becomes you to forget——
'Tis one Thing madly || to diſperſe my Store——

" But an Action may be conceived leaving
" out a particular Modification, preciſely

" as a Subject may be conceived leaving " out a particular Quality; and therefore " when by Inverſion the Verb is firſt in- " troduced, it has no bad Effect to inter- " ject a Pauſe betwixt it and the Adverb " which follows.

" The Agent and its Action come next, " expreſſed in Grammar by the active " Subſtantive and its Verb. Betwixt " theſe, placed in their natural Order, " there is no Difficulty of interjecting a " Pauſe: An active Being is not always " in Motion; and therefore it is eaſily ſe- " parable in Idea from its Action: when " in a Sentence the Subſtantive takes the " Lead, we know not that Action is to " follow; and as Reſt muſt precede the " Commencement of Motion, this Inter- " val is a proper Opportunity for a Pauſe.

" But when by Inverſion the Verb is " placed firſt, is it lawful to ſeparate it " by a Pauſe from the active Subſtantive? " I anſwer, not, becauſe an Action is not " in Idea ſeparable from the Agent, more " than a Quality from the Subſtance to " which it belongs."

His Lordſhip proceeds to remark, that in like Manner the active Verb and the paſſive

paſſive Subſtantive, placed in what he calls their natural Order, that is, the Verb preceding the Subſtantive, muſt not be ſeparated by a Pauſe; and that, on the other hand, when the paſſive Subſtantive is firſt named, there is no Difficulty or Impropriety in interjecting a Pauſe betwixt it and the Verb.

On this Head he makes the following general Obſervations, viz. that the natural Order * of placing the active Subſtantive and its Verb, is more friendly to a Pauſe than the inverted Order: but that in all the other Connections, Invention affords by far a better Opportunity for a Pauſe.

As to Words connected by Conjunctions and Prepoſitions, his Lordſhip juſtly obſerves, they admit freely of a Pauſe. Connecting Particles, ſays he, were invented to unite in a Period two Subſtantives ſignifying Things occaſionally united in the Thought, but which have no natural Union: and betwixt two Things not only ſeparable in Idea, but really diſtinct, the Mind, for the ſake of Melody,

* His Lordſhip had called it, with more Propriety, the habitual Order, for the Reaſons given in the firſt Section of the ſucceeding Chapter.

chearfully admits, by a Pauſe, a momentary Disjunction of their occaſional Union.

With regard to Conjunctions, Prepoſitions, Articles, and ſuch like Acceſſories, paſſing under the Name of Particles; Lord Kaims lays it down as a Rule, that they are of themſelves mere Cyphers, and cannot be ſeparated by any Pauſe from the Words that render them ſignificant.

It is a great Pity that, in his treating this Subject, his Lordſhip was all the while labouring to ſupport a falſe Hypotheſis; by acceding to the Neceſſity of there being always a Pauſe in the Middle of an Heroic Verſe or Line: For hence it happens, that the Examples he adduces, by no Means prove the Rules he lays down. If he had always ſtuck by his Opinion, "That the Pauſe in the Melody cannot "be in better Company than with a Pauſe "in the Senſe," and had carried on his Inveſtigation of the Nature and Place of the Pauſes with that View, I am perſuaded he would have been more ſucceſsful in this ingenious Enquiry, than he has been.

It is very true, that many of the Lines he cites, as exceptionable, are not poetical; but it is not becauſe their Senſe will not

not admit of a Pauſe exactly in the Middle of the Line; but becauſe they either will not admit of any Pauſe at all, and are therefore too long for a poetic Meaſure, or they admit of ſo many Pauſes as to divide the Line into Parts too ſhort to flow.

Thus the following Lines;

Theſe Madmen ever hurt the Church or State,——
How ſhall we fill a Library with Wit.——
What better teach a Foreigner the Tongue?——

are not exceptionable or unpoetical merely becauſe the Senſe doth not admit of a Pauſe, as his Lordſhip obſerves, after the Words *hurt*, *fell*, and *teach*; but becauſe they admit of no Pauſe at all.

Again, the following Lines have one Period in each too long for a Meaſure, and one too ſhort, and thus are rendered unpoetical by the Contraſt.

Sure, if I ſpare the Miniſter, no rules——
Taſte, that eternal Wanderer, which flies——

No ſuch Objection can be made to this Line,

For Spirits, freed from mortal Laws, with Eaſe—&c.

And yet it will not admit of a Pauſe in the Middle.

What his Lordſhip obſerves, with regard to the concluding Pauſe of the Couplet, is indeed true with reſpect to all others, whether in Proſe or Verſe, " that they never can be graceful, unleſs " when they accompany a Pauſe in the " Senſe."

Hence it is pretty evident, after all that hath been written upon the Subject of numerous Compoſition, oratorial Periods and poetical Meaſures, that the Pauſes required in Reading may be marked by the common Modes of Punctuation uſed by Writers.

The Abbé Batteux confeſſes, indeed, that the Pauſes of Reſpiration and thoſe of the Mind may be diſtinguiſhed by the Punctuation; although thoſe of the Objects, when they do not fall in with thoſe of the Mind, cannot be diſtinguiſhed by any ſenſible Mark in Writing; nor yet in Pronunciation, but by a particular Tone or Inflection of the Voice, or certain hardly perceptible Breaks, *quaſdam impreſſiones*, which are directed only by Taſte, or by a clear and diſtinct Manner natural to the Perſon who is ſpeaking. And hence it is, ſays the Abbé, that we meet

meet with ſo few People capable of reading ſo as to give their Hearers Pleaſure and Satisfaction.

Mr. Sheridan, in treating the Subject of Pauſes, appears to be as juſtly ſenſible as Batteux, of the Uſe of Tones to regulate the Pauſes.

" It is evident, ſays he, that to mark " the Stops properly in Writing, every " perceptible Ceſſation of Sound in the " Voice ought to have a Mark; but this " is far from being the Caſe in the pre- " ſent Practice of Punctuation, continual " Inſtances occurring, where the Voice " ought to be ſuſpended, without any " Comma appearing; and Inſtances as " frequent, where Commas are put down " in Places, where there ought to be no " Suſpenſion of the Voice. The Truth " is, the modern Art of Punctuation was " not taken from the Art of Speaking, " which was never ſtudied by the Mo- " derns, but was in a great Meaſure re- " gulated by the Rules of Grammar; " that is, certain Parts of Speech are " kept together, and others divided by " Stops, according to their grammatical " Conſtruction, often without Reference

to

" to the Pauſes uſed in Diſcourſe. And " the only general Rule, by which Pauſes " can be regulated, has been either un- " known, or unattended to: which is, " that Pauſes in general depend upon " Emphaſis."

In other Words it depends on the Senſe. But of what Nature is this Dependence? and how is it pointed out by the Emphaſis?

I have before ſhewn that, taking *Tone* in its ſtricteſt Senſe, it relates ſolely to the Key of the Voice; but we change this only as the Subject of the Diſcourſe changes, and that only at the End of Sentences, or very diſtinct Parts of Sentences; ſuch Tone regarding only the Subject in general, and not particular Words.

If we conſider Tone and Cadence in a looſer Senſe, as a Variation from loud to ſoft, it is very certain that the Nature of the Pauſes are determined by ſuch Variation much more than by their different Length of Time *.

Mr.

* Theſe Variations, as Mr. Sheridan very juſtly obſerves, declaring what Kind the Pauſes are of at the Inſtant they are made; and inform the Mind what it is to expect

Mr. Sheridan's Rule, therefore, for making proper Pauſes, is not an improper

expect from them; whether the Senſe is ſtill to be continued in the ſame Sentence; whether the ſucceeding one is to be the laſt Member of the Sentence; whether more are to enſue; or whether the Sentence be cloſed, and a new one is to begin.

The great Utility of this Practice will appear, continues Mr. Sheridan, when we conſider how neceſſary it is that the Hearer ſhould be able to accompany the Speaker in all that he utters, ſo as fully to comprehend his Meaning; and therefore he ſhould be ſpared the Trouble of attending to any thing elſe, but his Meaning. Now if Pauſes had no other Mark of Diſtinction, but the Time of their Duration, it is evident that not only the Speaker, muſt always be exceedingly nice, in obſerving the exacteſt Proportion of Time, with regard to the different Pauſes, (a Thing ſcarce practicable in irregular Diſcourſe) but the Hearer alſo muſt employ his whole Attention, during thoſe Pauſes, in meaſuring their exact Duration, without which he muſt miſtake their Nature; a thing equally impracticable, or which if attempted, muſt by this Diſtraction of the Attention, do great Injury to the principal Point in View, a full Conception of the Meaning. Whereas, when the Nature or kind of Pauſe is declared at its Beginning, by the ſure Mark of a Note or Tone of the Voice, it matters not afterwards to the Hearer, whether the Speaker obſerves any due Proportion of Time or not; for he is at that Inſtant prepared to accompany him, whenever he pleaſes to ſet out; whether it be ſuddenly, or whether he chuſes to delay longer than is neceſſary. For he knows by the Tone what the Pauſe ſhould be, whether the Speaker obſerves the due Proportion of Time or not.

one,

one, though it is little more than referring the Reader to his own Judgment, concerning the Modes of Voice moſt proper to expreſs the Senſe of what he reads.

" Whoever therefore has a Mind, ſays " he, to read any Piece correctly, muſt " ſtop according to this Rule. Let him " firſt find out and mark each emphatic " Word; then let him examine what " Number of Words belong to that em- " phatic one, and at the laſt of thoſe let " him place a Comma, or ſuch other " Stop as the Senſe requires. The Tones " appertaining to theſe Pauſes, and the " Time taken up in them, muſt be left to " his own Judgment; and his beſt Rule " will be to reflect what Tones he would " uſe, and what Time he would ſuſpend " his Voice, were he to ſpeak them as his " own immediate Sentiments. And who- " ever reads any thing at Sight, would do " well to pay as little Regard to the Stops " as poſſible, and be chiefly attentive to " the Meaning of the Words."

For my own Part, I do not ſee any Poſſibility of communicating ſufficient Rules for the Management of the Voice in

in this Particular; unleſs it may be done *vivâ você* by a good Speaker.

Even in this Caſe, however, there is Danger of the Learner's being a mere Mimic of the particular Sounds of his Maſter's *Voice*; without acquiring a Knowledge of the general Mode of Expreſſion. For, though we may determine what Words are to be emphaſized, and the comparative Streſs to be laid on them, yet different People have very different Modes of laying the ſame Streſs, or giving the ſame Degree of Significance to Words. Nay, the ſame Perſons frequently expreſs the ſame Words, equally ſignificantly, in very different Tones. Whoever remembers the various Methods in which Mr. Quin ſpoke the ſame Speeches, particularly in the Character of Sir John Falſtaff, will need no farther Conviction of what is advanced in this Particular.

With regard to thoſe Kinds of Tones, that, accompanied with Geſture, form the Language of the Paſſions, which is the ſame in all Nations and Countries, and is in a Manner independent of articulate Sounds, it is foreign to the Deſign of the preſent Eſſay.

CHAP. IV.

Of the Application of the preceding Rules and Obſervations to the Recital of the different Species of literary Compoſition.

SECT. I. *Of grammatical Conſtruction, and the natural Order of Words.*

IT will be neceſſary, in the Application of the foregoing Rules and Obſervations, to the Recital of the different Species of literary Compoſition, not only to begin with the moſt ſimple Stile or Mode of Speaking, but alſo to examine into the very Nature of its Simplicity.

It is generally imagined, that, in our ordinary Diſcourſe, and the common Narrative Stile in Writing, the Words follow each other in a *natural* Order. It will appear, however, on cloſer Examination, that inſtead of *natural*, we ſhould ſay *habitual:* for this Order is different in different Languages; which, it is preſumed, would not be the Caſe, if our Words ſucceeded each other in the very Order in which

which our Ideas ariſe, and combine themſelves in the Mind*.

The Abbé Batteaux makes a Diſtinction, indeed, between the Order in which our Ideas ariſe in the Mind, and that in which they flow from us, when they are annexed to Words, and are arranged in the regular Succeſſion of Diſcourſe. It is this latter which he denominates the natural Order of Words, and which, he ſays, ſhould be the ſame in the Narration of Things, as that ſubſiſting in the Things related. There ſtill remains, nevertheleſs, a conſiderable Degree of Difficulty in determining what this Order is, or ſhould be. If we would make the Hearer

* Unleſs, indeed, there be in the Mind, as ſome have ſuggeſted, a Kind of grammatical Arrangement, relative to the Rules eſtabliſhed for the Mechaniſm of the Language in which we intend to expreſs ourſelves. A Suggeſtion by no means improbable, if we reflect on the intimate Connection which Language bears even to Thought: for it is very certain that we ſtudy, as well as ſpeak, in ſome one Language, and that we cannot compoſe ſo well in any other. Nay, thoſe who underſtand a Variety of Languages and Sciences, will tell us, that ſome Subjects are much better inveſtigated by them in one Language than in another. This is too nice a Diſcuſſion, however, to be entered upon in this Place.

conſent to what we are ſaying to him, it is ſaid, we ought to determine the Stations of the Objects by their Degree of Importance; and conſequently give the firſt Place to the Words expreſſing the moſt intereſting Object.

Agreeable to this Rule, the Critic juſt mentioned, obſerves, that the Latin and Greek Languages follow the Order of Nature in their Conſtruction; and that this Order is violated by that of moſt other Languages.

Be this Matter as it will, the Difference of Conſtruction in various Languages ſufficiently proves, that each hath a Mode in ſome Degree peculiar to itſelf; which may not improperly be ſtiled the *idiomatical* Order of ſuch Language. Father Cerceau, it is true, tells us, that "in the "Latin Conſtruction, provided the Words "which ſhould enter into the Compoſition "of a Sentence, be there collected, it "is very often of little Importance in "what Order they are placed, and what "Rank they poſſeſs: as that which is "placed in the Beginning of the Period, "might as well be placed at the End: ſo "that by throwing the Words of a Sentence

" tence confuſedly into a Hat, and draw-
" ing them out one after another, like
" Lottery-Tickets, their Arrangement
" would be found always ſufficiently re-
" gular."

Mr. Sheridan adopts this Opinion concerning the Latin Language; and ſpeaks of it as an Advantage or Perfection in that Tongue; but I cannot help thinking, with Father Cerceau, that it is rather a Diſadvantage, or Imperfection, tending to render that Language leſs preciſe and intelligible. This caſual and adventitious Poſition of Words, however, is, like the fortuitous Concourſe of Atoms, in a great Degree chimerical. It is true that ſome Languages, and the Latin in particular, admit of a greater Diverſity of Tranſpoſition than others: But notwithſtanding the Latitude allowed them in this Reſpect, in rhetorical and poetical Compoſition, it is certain that the Latin, as well as all other Languages, hath an idiomatical Succeſſion, or Order of Words, in the Stile of common Diſcourſe, and ſimple Narration, which is in a great Degree peculiar to itſelf.

With regard to modern Languages, it is certain they have not only an idiomatical Arrangement of Words peculiar to each, but their Modes of Tranſpoſition are alſo equally peculiar; while ſome of them, particularly the French, will hardly admit of any Tranſpoſition of Words at all.

Now one of the firſt and moſt indiſpenſible Qualifications in the Reader of any Language, is a perfect Knowledge in the idiomatical Order of its Words in common Diſcourſe and ſimple Narration. Indeed, the grammatical Conſtruction of modern Tongues, depends ſo much on this Order of Succeſſion in the Words, that they will by no Means admit of arbitrary Tranſpoſition; without being rendered equivocal or unintelligible. In Latin, it matters little whether it ſhould be written *Patrem filius amat*, or *Filius patrem amat*. It is ſtill *The Son doth love the Sire*, and cannot be miſconſtrued; but if, inſtead of writing according to the ſimple Mode of Expreſſion in Engliſh, the Words ſhould be tranſpoſed, and we ſhould write *The Son the Sire doth love*, or *The Sire the Son doth love*, the Sentence would be equivocal.

The

The Study of Variety in Stile, and Pomp of Diction, hath led many Writers into equivocal Modes of Expreſſion; while others again have fallen into it through mere Careleſſneſs and Inattention*. The firſt Beauty of Stile, however, is Propriety, without which all Ornament is puerile and ſuperfluous. The ſame may be ſaid of the Recital of what is written.

Now the Tranſpoſition of Words being very common in our Language, and ſometimes even in our ordinary Diſcourſe, by way of rendering it more ſignificant†, it behoves the Reader to be well appriſed of the idiomatical Order of Words, and of all the allowed Modes of Tranſpoſition.

Nothing indeed is more neceſſary to qualify the Reader to repeat what is laid before him at Sight, and of Courſe to facilitate his entering into the Author's Meaning,

* Lord Kaims adduces a number of Examples, in his Elements of Criticiſm, to ſhew that our beſt Writers have not duly attended to the proper Arrangement of Words: By which means the Senſe hath been rendered doubtful and equivocal.

† Thus, in ſimply indicating my Intention to go home, I ſhould ſay, *I muſt go home.* If my deſign were oppoſed, it would be idiomatically enforced by the Tranſpoſition, *Home I muſt go.*

than ſuch a general Acquaintance with the idiomatical Modes of Expreſſion, and the uſual Arrangement of Words. It is from a Knowledge of this Arrangement, that the Auditor ſo readily accompanies, and ſometimes even anticipates the Meaning of the Speaker; as it is from the ſame Knowledge that the Speaker is enabled to deliver his Sentiments with Care and Fluency. Without this, he might have what Plenty or Choice of Words he pleaſed, he would never be able to ſpeak his own Sentiments, or repeat thoſe of others, with Grace or Propriety.

Hence it is that Foreigners, even after having acquired a *copia verborum* and a tolerable Pronunciation of particular Words, yet ſpeak in a very different Manner from the Natives. The French and Engliſh differ but little in this Reſpect, as the Arrangement of their Words, in common Diſcourſe, is nearly the ſame. But the German and Low-Dutch uſe a Number of Parentheſes, and generally cloſe their Sentences, in Imitation of the Latin, with a Verb, that governs the whole; ſo that their Periods are ſupported with a more equal Tenour of Voice, and gene-

rally

rally close with a full and bold Sound: Whereas the French and English usually bringing out their least significant Words last, drop their Voice towards the latter End of their Sentences, and close them feebly. The Effect of this Habit is very evident in their Repeating and Speaking Latin; in which most other Nations have the Advantage over them, for this Reason perhaps more than any other.

Persons conversant in many Languages, will take upon them to sometimes determine what Language another speaks, although they should not be near enough to hear a single Syllable articulately; being sufficiently informed by the general Cadence of the Voice in Discourse. Indeed the Difficulty seems not to be very great; as there must be a sensible Difference between the Tenour of Voice pronouncing the German Periods of a Mile, and the perpetual Catches and Breaks, that are inseparable from the Shreds and Patches of a French *tête a tête*.

As to the Acquisition of this Knowledge of the idiomatical Order of Expression, Natives of a good Education are

ſeldom at a loſs in *Speaking*, and by a due Attention to the Stile of the moſt ſimple, preciſe and elegant Writers, may attain all that is neceſſary to enable them to profit by it in *Reading*.

With regard to Foreigners, indeed, it is neceſſary that they ſhould be inſtructed in the particular Influence, which the idiomatical Order, and the Tranſpoſition of our Words, have on the grammatical Conſtruction of the Sentence they compoſe. But this is not the Place to enter upon ſo copious a Subject.

SECT II. *Of ſimple Narrative, or* mere *Relation.*

As Narrative is a mere Declaration, or ſimple Expoſition of a Fact or Event; the Manner of reciting it will neceſſarily depend on the Nature of ſuch Event; as ſhould alſo the Stile in which it is recited. Thus a Narrative may be either grave and ſolemn, chearful and lively, droll or ſerious, important or indifferent: in all which Caſes, the Manner of reciting, as well as the Language in which it is related, ſhould be adapted to the Subject. At the ſame Time, however, a moſt perfect Simplicity is to be obſerved throughout:

out: No Declamation, no Pathos whatever, being required in the mere Relation of a Fact; the Knowledge of which only is intended to be conveyed to the Reader. But, if we except the dry unintereſting Articles of our common News-Papers, with the tedious Details of mere Matter-of-Fact Hiſtorians, we ſhall find ſo little of this Kind of Writing, that, conſidering it the moſt eaſy of all Kinds of Reading, it is needleſs to dwell upon the Mode of its Recital.

It is, indeed, hardly poſſible for a Writer, of the leaſt ſpark of Genius or Imagination, to relate the Circumſtances of a Fact or Event, without deſcribing ſomething of the Characters or Scene of Action: All that is requiſite therefore to be ſaid on this Subject, belongs with more Propriety to the following Section.

It may not be improper, however, to obſerve, that there is a wide Difference between *Simplicity* and *Familiarity*; a Circumſtance in which our Declaimers are ſo very frequently miſtaken. They cannot deſcend from the *pompous*, without ſinking into the vulgar; both of which

ought to be equally avoided in the Recital of indifferent Subjects,

Nothing can be more ridiculous than the affected Airs of Dignity and Importance, with which moſt Readers recite oratorial and poetical Compoſition. Thus the moſt inſignificant Meſſage, if couched under the Form of a Couplet, or hitched into Blank-Verſe, is delivered by the buſkined Valets of the Theatre, with as much Solemnity and Importance, as the moſt pathetic Paſſages in a Tragedy.

On the other hand, I have ſeen ſome Actors, aware of the Impropriety, run into the other Extreme; and affecting Eaſe and Simplicity, converſe, in the Characters of Heroes, of the Fate of Kingdoms, with as much Familiarity as if they were chatting of theatrical Affairs in the Green-Room.

I remember, in particular, to have heard the whole Audience burſt into an immoderate Peal of Laughter, on *Romeo*'s ſaying to his Man——*You know my Lodging*; ſo exceſſively ludicrous did a familiar Tone of Voice make this ſhort Sentence. I well remember alſo, that, to avoid the like Error, the next Time the

Cha-

Character was played by the ſame Actor, he pronounced theſe Words in as plaintive and ſad a Tone as if the Circumſtance itſelf was to be numbered among his greateſt Misfortunes.

It is certain that the Tranſpoſition of Words, or a Deviation from their idiomatical Order of Succeſſion, will give either an Air of Stiffneſs or of real Dignity to the Stile, and neceſſarily communicate a ſeeming Importance to the Voice of the Speaker *. But if the Subject itſelf be trivial, the Speaker ſhould endeavour to remedy the Defect of the Writer; by giving as little Importance to the Words as poſſible in Pronunciation. On the other hand, if any intereſting or important Circumſtance ſhould be related in a creeping, vulgar, idiomatical Stile, it

* A very little Reflection will ſerve to convince the Reader what an Effect this different Arrangement of Words muſt have on the Manner of Speaking and Reading. For, though the Tranſpoſition of Words can never vary the Place of the Emphaſis, unleſs the Meaning be alſo altered by ſuch Tranſpoſition; yet it is very plain that the general Mode of pronouncing the Sentence will be altered; as is exemplified particularly in our Repetitions of Blank-Verſe, which, if well written, cannot be recited in the ſame familiar Tone and Cadence as common Diſcourſe.

would

would be proper, in the Recital, to give it all the Dignity of a preciſe and full Pronunciation.

Sect. III. Of *Deſcription.*

It is remarkable, with regard to verbal Deſcriptions, that ſome of the fineſt in the Engliſh Language are to be met with in our Dramatic Poems; and, at the ſame Time, that theſe Paſſages are thoſe whoſe Beauty the Actor is leaſt capable of communicating to an Audience. Nay, ſo extremely difficult is it to recite moſt verbal Deſcriptions with tolerable Succeſs, that we have ſeen Actors, capable of managing our Paſſions as they pleaſed, hardly capable of rendering themſelves intelligible, in reciting the mere deſcriptive Paſſages that occurred in their Parts.

That this Difficulty does not ariſe from any Defect in the Deſcriptions themſelves, is evident from the Effect which they have on the Reader, peruſing them in Silence. Is it that the Analogy between Poetry and Painting is confined to written Language; and that the ſame Images

are

are not ſo readily excited by the Sound, as by the Sight of the Words expreſſing them? This really ſeems to be the Caſe; with reſpect at leaſt to the Deſcription of inanimate Scenes. As to animated Scenes, indeed, the Voice ſeems, on the other hand, to be the peculiar Language of the Paſſions*; while the Sight appears to be more immediately adapted to the Underſtanding.

But this Suggeſtion is merely ſpeculative. One Reaſon, I preſume, for the Incapacity of public Speakers to deſcribe inanimate Scenes to their Audience, is a miſtaken Attempt to convey, by artful Pronunciation, ſuch Images as the verbal Deſcriptions excite in their own Minds, to thoſe of their Auditors. There is ſo little Similitude, however, between the Objects, as well as the Senſes, of *Sight* and *Hearing*, that this Artifice defeats its own End. To perceive the Beauty of an inanimate Deſcription, the Scene muſt actually riſe up in the Imagi-

* Agreeable to this Notion, I remember to have heard a celebrated Critic offer to wager, that, Mrs. Cibber would bring Tears into the Eyes of her Audience, by repeating, in her Tragic Strain, a Paragraph from the Daily Advertiſer.

nation

nation, which it does in Conformity to the viſual Faculty; ſo that the Sound of the Voice is in moſt Caſes * hurtful to the

* Some may chuſe to except thoſe in which the Effects of Sound are deſcribed; as the Voice may be ſuppoſed to aſſiſt the Similitude or Imitation intended by the Poet. For my Part, however, I have always thought even theſe Reſemblances better conceived than repreſented.

Nobody is inſenſible of the Similitude between the Senſe and Sound, in peruſing many Paſſages of our Poets; but it would rather create Diſguſt, than ſerve to heighten the Similitude, if the Reader ſhould affect to roar like the Waves in reciting,

But when loud Surges laſh the ſounding Shore,
The hoarſe rough Verſe ſhould like a Torrent roar.

Again, how ridiculous to attempt to *ruſtle*, *crackle* and *craſh*, like a falling Oak, in reciting

Loud Sounds the Ax, redoubling Strokes on Strokes;
On all Sides round the Foreſt hurls her Oaks
Headlong. Deep-echoing groan the Tickets brown,
Then RUSTLING, CRACKLING, CRASHING, *thunder down.*

A Reſemblance between inarticulate and articulate Sounds may be much better conceived than practiſed; as the imagined Beauty will almoſt always turn out a real Defect, it being inconſiſtent with the very Purpoſe of Speech, to render it leſs intelligible by the Imitation of inarticulate Sounds. It is almoſt impoſſible in the diſtinct Pronunciation of the following Lines, to preſerve the Sound of a Bow-String therein imitated.

——————The String let fly,
Twang'd ſhort and ſharp, like the ſhrill Swallows cry.

readi-

readineſs and clearneſs of our Conception; the bare Words only exciting the requiſite Ideas, while the Ear is amuſed with a Senſation foreign to the Nature of the Object, and thence the Attention is divided; which in ſilent Reading is directed to one Senſe only.

It is in vain for the Reader, therefore, to think of conveying Deſcriptions of inanimate Scenes, more forcibly to the Hearer, by any Artifice of Pronunciation*. The Reſemblance which the Im-

* How abſurdly have I heard ſome Declaimers attempt to heighten the Deſcription in the following Lines of Shakeſpear, by affecting alternately to *hum* and *whiſper* out their Words, as thoſe Circumſtances were deſcribed!

From Camp to Camp, through the foul Womb of Night,
The Hum of either Army ſtilly Sounds,
That the fixt Centinels almoſt receive
The ſecret Whiſpers of each other's Watch.

Nay, I have known ſome, not deſpicable Actors, make an accordant Motion with their Hands, in repeating

The Armourers, accompliſhing the Knights
With buſy Hammers cloſing Rivets up; &c.

At which the Audience have ſometimes laughed, with as much Propriety, as they do at Jobſon's hammering the old Shoe, when he ſings

And then Her Soul at Heaven's Gate
Did knock——moſt mightily.

preſſions,

preſſions, made by ſome Words, bear to that of the Objects or Ideas they expreſs*, ſhould not miſlead the Reader to endeavour to heighten that Reſemblance, by any Mimickry that may obſcure the Articulation. The Paſſions, as is before obſerved, may be affected with Tones and inarticulate Sounds; but Images cannot be excited in the Imagination, or Sentiments conveyed to the Underſtanding, without diſtinct and preciſe Words. Hence it follows, that the moſt ſimple Modes of Pronunciation ſhould be uſed in the Recital of ſuch Deſcriptions.

It is, therefore, with great Propriety that the ſimple Narrative and Deſcription of inanimate Scenes are, in the ancient Drama, put into the Mouths of the Chorus; who, not being intereſted as Characters in the Play, are ſuppoſed to be diveſted of Paſſion, and more capable of ſuch diſtinct Relation.

In the Recital of animated or pathetic Deſcriptions the Caſe is otherwiſe; and it is not improper for the Reader to be, or *ſeem* affected by the Paſſion he deſcribes:

* See Kaim's Elements of Criticiſm. Vol. II. p. 353.

always

always obſerving, however, that his own Senſibility ſhould be ſubſervient to that of the Hearer. For if he be himſelf ſo much affected, as to be incapable of that Preciſion of Recital which is neceſſary to convey the like Affections to the Audience, he of Courſe defeats his own Purpoſe.

I have known ſome young Tragedians enter ſo feelingly into their Parts, that they have been choaked up with Paſſion in the moſt pathetic Scenes; ſo that they could hardly get a Word out of their Mouths. Among the Comic Actors alſo, I have known ſome ſo intent upon the Humour of their Part, that they have concealed the Jeſt from the Audience by their own Laughter.

I ſhall cite here ſome favourite Deſcriptions, both of the paſſionate and diſpaſſionate Kind, that the Reader may more fully comprehend the Application intended.

Of all the unimpaſſioned Deſcriptions that are to be met with in our Engliſh Poets, the following of the Gate of Paradiſe, in the 4th Book of Milton's Paradiſe Loſt, is perhaps one of the moſt conciſe and magnificent.

The

——————The ſetting Sun
Slowly deſcended, and with right Aſpect
Againſt the eaſtern Gate of *Paradiſe*
Level'd his *Evening Rays:* It was a Rock
Of *Alabaſter*, pil'd up to the *Clouds*,
Conſpicuous far, winding with *one* Aſcent
Acceſſible from *Earth*, one Entrance *high*;
The *Reſt* was *craggy Cliff*, that *overhung*
Still as it *roſe*, *impoſſible* to *climb*.
Betwixt theſe rocky Pillars *Gabriel* ſat,
Chief of the angelic Guards, awaiting *Night*;
About him exercis'd *heroic Games*
Th' *unarmed* Youth of *Heav'n*, but *nigh* at Hand
Celeſtial *Armoury*, Shields, Helms, and Spears,
Hung high, with *Diamond* flaming, and with *Gold*.

The Grandeur of the Object here deſcribed, is apt to make the unexperienced Reader aſſume a loud or pompous Tone of Voice in reciting it. It is to be obſerved, however, that, as the Streſs of Voice is made Uſe of to expreſs the Paſſions, we ſhould be very cautious to diſtinguiſh between the *Pathos* and mere Dignity. I remember to have heard a famous Declaimer recite this Paſſage, with as much Self-ſufficiency and Exultation as if he himſelf had been the Architect of the Pillars and Entrance deſcribed. It is impoſſible, indeed, to repreſent *that* to others,

of

of which we entertain not a competent Idea ourſelves, as well in Reading as in Writing. The Deſcription of the Writer may be as juſt as it will, the Reader who recites his Words, without having an Idea of the Object deſcribed, will be in a great Degree unintelligible. That which is difficult for us to conceive, alſo, will be difficult for us to convey to others: Hence the utmoſt Degree of Clearneſs and Preciſion ought to be obſerved in ſuch Recital. At the ſame Time the Reader ſhould diſtinguiſh between the *Intereſt* and *Attention* of his Hearers. When the Auditor is really *intereſted* he will attend of courſe; but his Attention may be kept on the ſtretch to an high Degree, without his being intereſted at all. Deſcriptions of inanimate Scenes, and ſtill Life, being ſeldom very intereſting, care ſhould be taken to avoid every Affectation of making them ſo; for by exciting the Paſſions, when we ſhould only engage the Attention, our Deſign is defeated. A Mock-Intereſt bewilders the Attention of the Hearer, and renders every Thing we ſay unintelligible.

Such miſtaken Declamation is like the contemptible Oratory of an antick Mountebank, or modern Auctioneer, calculated only to impoſe on the Ignorant by pompous Deſcriptions of Trifles.

It is true, that ſometimes the moſt ſimple Deſcriptions cannot be read, or recited, without exciting the Senſations of Delight, Terror, Diſguſt, &c. which they were intended to excite. But as the Reader ſhould convey theſe Senſations with the Ideas of the Objects to the Hearer; he ought to prevent the former taking ſuch hold of his Senſibility, as to obſcure, or hinder his Communication of the latter.

When Perſons read to themſelves they may indulge this Senſibility as far as they pleaſe, as it ariſes from their Attention to the Objects deſcribed: but in reciting ſuch Deſcriptions to others, they ſhould conſider only the effect of their Recital on their Hearers; to engage whoſe Attention to the Objects is the Buſineſs of the Reader.

Who can read the Deſcription of Sin and Death in Paradiſe Loſt, with many Paſſages in Spenſer's Fairy Queen, and in other

other Poems, without Horror and Diſguſt? But if, in reciting them to others, we ſhould expreſs all we feel, we might diſguſt our Hearers indeed, but we ſhould not be able to give them a true Idea of the Object of that Diſguſt. In a Word, the Underſtanding ſhould always be informed, or the Imagination employed, before the Paſſions are excited.

It is an Error, founded on the miſconſtrued Maxim of Horace, *ſi vis me flere* &c. to ſuppoſe it the Buſineſs of a Reciter, Orator, or even Player, to be really affected with their own Diſcourſe. It is not requiſite that a Tragedian ſhould ſtand blubbering, or a Comedian ſniggering behind the Scenes, till he receives his Cue. We go to a Tragedy or Comedy to cry or laugh ourſelves, at the Diſtreſs of a Lear, or the Humour of a Falſtaff; and not at the Tears of a Powel, or the Grimace of a Shuter. I do not mean by this, that the Reader ſhould ſtifle the *appearance* of Senſibility; he ought to have it all; and this, I preſume, is as much as Horace meant.

Who can recite the following Deſcription, without all the Appearance of that

Complacency, which the ſilent Peruſal of it naturally inſpires.

So paſs'd they *naked* on, nor ſhunn'd the Sight
Of *God* or *Angel*, for they thought no *Ill:*
So Hand in Hand they *paſs'd*, the *loveliest Pair*
That ever *ſince* in *Love's* Embraces *met*;
Adam the *goodlieſt* Man of *Men* ſince *born*
His Sons, the *faireſt* of her *Daughters* Eve.
Under a *Tuft* of *Shade*, that on a *Green*
Stood *whiſpering ſoft*, by a freſh *Fountain Side*
They *ſat* them *down*; and after no more *Toil*
Of their ſweet gardening Labour than *ſuffic'd*
To *recommend* cool *Zephyr*, and made *Eaſe*
More *eaſy*, wholſome Thirſt and Appetite
More grateful, to their *Supper* Fruits they *fell*;
Nectarine Fruits which the *compliant* Boughs
Yielded them, Side-long as they ſat *recline*
On the *ſoft downy Bank damaſk'd* with *Flowers*.
The *ſavoury Pulp* they *chew*, and in the *Rind*
Still as they *thirſted* ſcoop the brimming *Stream:*
Nor gentle *Purpoſe*, nor endearing *Smiles*
Wanted, nor youthful *Dalliance* as *beſeems*
Fair Couple, *link'd* in happy *nuptial* League,
Alone as *they*. *About* them friſking *play'd*
All Beaſts of th' *Earth*, *ſince wild*, and of all *Chaſe*
In *Wood* or *Wilderneſs*, *Foreſt* or *Den*.
Sporting the *Lion* ramp'd, and in his Paw
Dandled the *Kid*; *Bears*, *Tigers*, *Ounces*, *Pards*,
Gambol'd before them; th' *unwieldy Elephant*
To make them *Mirth* us'd all his *Might*, and *wreath'd*
His *lithe Proboſcis*; *cloſe* the *Serpent* ſly
Inſinuating, wove with *Gordian* Twine
His *breaded* Train; and of his *fatal Guile*

Gave

Gave Proof *unheeded. Others* on the *Graſs*
Couch'd, and now *fill'd* with *Paſture gazing* ſat,
Or bedward *ruminating*; for the *Sun,*
Declin'd, was *haſting* now with *prone Career*
To th' *Ocean Iſles,* and in th' *aſcending* Scale
Of *Heav'n* the *Stars* that uſher *Evening* roſe:

It is yet certain, that, if the Complacence which this Deſcription muſt naturally inſpire, ſhould work upon the Reader the Effects of Exultation, it would ſerve only to render him leſs intelligible; all the Paſſions, whether of Joy, Sorrow, Rage, or Fear, being deſtructive of Articulation.

Now, though an Orator engaged in a bad Cauſe, or an Actor reciting Nonſenſe, may find it expedient to employ Artifice to excite the Perſuaſion or Paſſion in the Audience, which a juſt Idea of his Declamation would not inſpire; yet this is not the Buſineſs of a juſt and faithful Reciter. He ſhould endeavour always to keep himſelf perfectly calm, and aſſume the Appearance only of ſuch Paſſions as naturally ariſe from the Subject. It were, otherwiſe, impoſſible for him to make thoſe frequent Tranſitions from Mirth to Sadneſs, from Anger to Submiſſion, from

Love to Hate, &c. as the Change of Subject in Reading requires.

When the Heart is really affected, it is impoſſible for us to ſhift Appearances eaſily; nor can the Tongue, which really faulters through Fear, either properly deſcribe the Cauſe of it, or ſtop its Palpitation immediately, to aſſume the firm and ſtedfaſt Voice of Reſolution and Fortitude.

Hence it is plain, that in reciting all Kinds of Deſcription, whether of Still-Life, or Paſſion, the Reader ſhould endeavour to poſſeſs himſelf of juſt Ideas of the Objects deſcribed, and to affect only ſuch Paſſions and Emotions which ſuch Deſcriptions will really excite in the Heart of the Hearer.

But here I muſt deſire the Reader not to forget that I am ſpeaking of the Recital of what is *written*, and not of *extempore Delivery*. In the latter, the Imagination and the Paſſions reciprocally operate on each other; but, when the Imagination is not upon *Invention*, and hath nothing more to do than barely to conceive what is laid before the Eye, or preſented by Memory to the Mind, our own

Paſſions

Paſſions ſhould be quite tranquil, to enable us to aſſume and diverſify their Appearance in reciting to others.

Sect. IV. Of *Preaching, Pleading, and other publick Speaking.*

Much hath been objected againſt the Clergy of the Church of England, on account of their *Reading* Sermons, inſtead of Speaking them *extempore*. The ſame Rules, however, have been laid down for Preaching in both Caſes, although very different ones are requiſite. In a Treatiſe on the Art of Preaching, now before me is the following Paſſage; tending to invalidate moſt of what is advanced in the preceding Section.

" Be Maſter of your Subject, and as it
" were *inſpired* with it; and then Light
" and Order will naturally dawn upon it;
" Every thing will fall into the Place
" which becomes it beſt: One Part will
" introduce another, juſt at the time that
" the Minds of the Audience are pre-
" pared to receive it; and what follows
" will ſupport and fortify that which
" went before: The more plain and ſim-

" ple Truths will pave the Way to the
" more abſtruſe and complex ones; and
" the Proofs or Illuſtrations will ſtill riſe,
" one above the other, in a regular and
" eaſy Gradation, till the whole Force
" of Conviction breaks upon the Mind,
" and now allows you fair Scope to play
" upon every tender and paſſionate String,
" that belongs to the Heart of Man.
" Then be ſure to *feel* every Sentiment
" yourſelf, and to enter firſt into every
" Paſſion you want to communicate to
" Others: And unleſs your Imagination
" plays its Part very ill, the boldeſt Fi-
" gures, the ſtrongeſt Images, and the
" moſt moving Expreſſions will pour in
" upon you, and animate your whole
" Diſcourſe and Manner with ſuch Life
" and Spirit, as cannot fail of winding up
" the Hearer's Mind to the utmoſt Pitch
" of Attention and of Paſſion. If you
" are thoroughly touched with the Im-
" portance and Dignity of the great Sub-
" jects of Religion and Virtue, you will
" not be ambitious of the Reputation of
" *fine Speakers*, nor ſtudy the little Orna-
" ments of a *gaudy* Eloquence, ſuch as
" pretty Similes, ſtrained Antitheſes, po-

liſhed

" liſhed Periods, and the Play of Wit or
" Words. I am far from diſcouraging
" the cloſeſt Study and Application of
" Mind to one's Subject, previous to the
" appearing in public: But a great deal
" muſt be left to the extemporary Efforts
" of Nature, when the Speaker is enli-
" vened with all the animating Circum-
" ſtances which attend public Speaking.
" That Man who has ranged every
" Thought, meaſured every Sentence,
" Tranſition, and Circumſtance of his
" Diſcourſe, and ſettled the whole Me-
" thod of his Delivery in his Cloſet, may
" be indeed an elegant and correct Speak-
" er; but I will venture to ſay, he can
" never be a popular and powerful Ora-
" tor: He will fall into a cold phlegma-
" tic Manner of Speaking; or if he throw
" himſelf into a forced Heat, it will ap-
" pear artificial, or elſe evaporate in a te-
" dious inſipid Sameneſs of Voice and Ac-
" tion; either of which are the dead
" Weights of genuine Eloquence. Where-
" as if the Speaker be thoroughly en-
" lightened and warmed with his Subject,
" and feels *himſelf* the Paſſion he means
" to inſpire, *Nature*, in that caſe will
" ſug-

" ſuggeſt the moſt becoming Ornaments,
" and ſignificant Phraſes; will vary the
" Tone of the Voice according to the
" Riſes and Falls, and different Turns of
" the Paſſion; and, in fine, will animate
" with the moſt expreſſive Air, Look,
" and Action, according to the ſeveral
" Feelings and Movements of the Mind.
" For *Nature* and *Paſſion* are more able
" Prompters than the moſt eminent Ma-
" ſters of Elocution.—Such a Speaker,
" with all his Repetitions, Breaks, Inac-
" curacies, and Chaſms in Diſcourſe, will
" force his way, through all Oppoſition,
" into the Bowels and Soul of the Hearer,
" and will kindle and ſet on fire his whole
" Frame; whilſt your ſmooth and ſtudied
" Declaimer will ſend him away as cool
" and unmoved as he found him."

Now, I agree with this Author, that in extempore Delivery, the Paſſions may be really affected, in Order to excite the Imagination to Invention; but I cannot agree that, becauſe extempore preaching would thence be more *animated*, it would therefore be the *beſt*. It is by no means likely that the Paſſions ſhould direct the Speaker in the moſt proper Form and Ar-

range-

rangement of the ſeveral Parts of his Diſcourſe; which is neceſſary to engage the Underſtanding, and thereby throw the *Force of Conviction* on the Mind. The Mind is not convicted every Time the Heart is affected.

If the Purpoſe of a Sermon, indeed, were, like that of a theatrical Entertainment, calculated merely to amuſe us, by ſporting with the Paſſions, the extempore Method might be preferable; but I am perſuaded that a truly pious rational Divine, would rather diſmiſs his Hearers *coolly convinced* of the Truth, and *ſtedfaſtly determined* to Religion, than *warmly perſuaded* by his Eloquence, or enraptured by a tranſitory Fit of Devotion.

It is further much more probable that the Matter and Compoſition of a *written* Diſcourſe, ſhould be preferable to an *extempore* one; nor is there any Likelihood that the Advantage, which the latter may reap from the more animated Manner of Delivery, ſhould compenſate for its other Defects. Add to this, that there is no *Neceſſity* for the Reader of a Sermon to have a leſs animated Delivery, than he who compoſes one as he delivers it. That moſt

Readers

Readers of Sermons have actually an *inanimated* Method of reciting, is no Argument that *they* muſt be ſo. It is the *Appearance* of Paſſion that affects the Hearer; not the *Reality* of it: So that there is no Neceſſity, as before obſerved, for the Reciter to be really affected. If there be, and *Nature* and *Paſſion* are, as this Writer aſſerts, more able Prompters than the moſt able Maſters of Elocution, I ſhould be glad to know what becomes of the *Art* he profeſſes to *teach*.

But I preſume it is needleſs to dwell longer on this Subject; as the Clergy have almoſt univerſally adopted the Cuſtom of reciting written Sermons.

The Mode of Recital is adopted alſo more and more in other Species of public Speaking. Our Barriſters, (at leaſt the moſt unexperienced and leaſt retentive of them) plead from written Briefs: Nay, it ſometimes happens, that the ſenatorial Flow of Eloquence itſelf is interrupted, and even privileged Tongues are obliged to have Recourſe to mental Lucubrations.

The great End of all public Speaking is effected in two Modes; viz. thoſe of

Con-

Conviction and *Perſuaſion*. The former of theſe is directed immediately to the Underſtanding, and the latter directly to the Heart. The former hath alſo this Advantage, that it always involves the latter: For we are ever fully perſuaded of the Truth of what we are convinced of; though we are not, on the other hand, always convinced of the Truth of what we are perſuaded to. A little Reflexion oft unravels the perſuaſive Sophiſtry of the moſt ſeductive Rhetorician; but the Force of the convincing Arguments of a Logician laſts as long as our Remembrance of them. Hence, it is evident, that with regard to any laſting Purpoſe, one Demonſtration, like thoſe of Euclid, is ſuperior to all the forcible and flowery Declamations of a Demoſthenes or a Cicero.

As to the temporary Purpoſes of carrying a Point in Parliament, a Cauſe in Weſtminſter Hall, or eſtabliſhing a Doctrine in the Church, when thoſe Purpoſes ſerve only to gratify the private Inclination or Intereſt of the Speaker; it is a Matter foreign to the Principles of juſt Elocution. Siniſter Ends muſt be attained

by

by falſe and artificial Means. Thus, if a Lawyer be engaged in a bad Cauſe, it is the Trick of his Profeſſion to prevent its appearing to the Court in its true Light: If he is to plead from a defective Brief, it is his Buſineſs to hurry inarticulately over the weaker Paſſages, and to dwell with Plainneſs and Preciſion on the ſtronger. It is the ſame in all Caſes. When demonſtrative Truth is the Object, we cannot addreſs ourſelves better than to the Underſtanding; when we would perſuade People into a Belief of what is problematical or falſe, we muſt addreſs ourſelves to their Paſſions; which cannot be done better than by confounding their Underſtandings.

It was from a Senſe of this, that the greateſt Judges of Oratory in the World, the Athenians, ſilenced the Voice of Declamation in the Areopagus. It is with Pleaſure, alſo, that I have ſometimes obſerved the venerable Judges of our Courts put a Stop to the *ſaucy Tongue of rattling Eloquence*, when it hath been wandering from the Point in hand. For by ſuch Declamations it is that Falſehood and In-

juſtice

juſtice obtain their tranſitory * Advantages. It would, doubtleſs, be agreeable to every Individual, to have the Art of working upon the Paſſions of Mankind as he pleaſed, and of perſuading them to believe whatever he ſhould tell them: But ſurely ſuch an Art, as it might be the moſt ſeductive, would be the moſt dangerous of all others. If the Perſon poſſeſſed of it were not the moſt virtuous of Mankind, to what pernicious Purpoſes might he not employ ſo faſcinating, ſo powerful an Art? Nor would this Art be unſucceſsful among an ignorant People, whoſe unenlightened Underſtandings ſhould be no Check on their Paſſions.

* Hence Acts of Parliament are frequently paſſed only to be repealed; and Orders of Court are made only to be reverſed. When their Duration is ſhort, they are attended with ſlight Inconveniences to the Publick; but the Practice on which they riſe, is often of the moſt fatal Conſequence to Individuals. Should the Judge of a Court of Equity, neglecting the Evidence that aſcertains the State of the Caſe before him, be prevailed on to liſten by the half Hour, to an illiberal Pleader, who, inſtead of Speaking to the Point in Hand, ſhould only laviſh Abuſe on the Party intereſted; and ſhould ſuch Judge upon this, retract his former Opinion of the Caſe itſelf, and pronounce him in the wrong whom a Pleader dares to Caluminate; what might not be the Conſequence!

As

As among a civilized and enlightened People, however, any Attempt to impoſe on their Underſtandings ſhould be treated with Contempt; I conſider the Art of Elocution as it is addreſſed to the Underſtanding, and by means of that to the Heart. The true Art of Speaking or Reading, is to affect the Paſſions by informing the Mind, and not by confounding the Imagination.

On this Suppoſition, therefore, that the Preacher, Pleader, or other Orator, means only to recommend the Truth, his firſt Buſineſs is to labour to *convince*; as, having done this, he need be under no Apprehenſion that his Diſcourſe will be totally ineffectual; which he may juſtly fear if he hath only attempted to perſuade. In one Caſe, a little Reflection may undo all he hath ſaid; but in the other, the longer People reflect, the more firmly are they perſuaded of its Truth. How often hath the Oratory of a Pulteney or a Pitt bore down all Oppoſition while they were ſpeaking; every Man in the Houſe appearing perſuaded of what they advanced, and ready to give his Aſſent? And yet, when the Larum was run down,

and

and their Auditors were permitted to reflect, how often hath the Queſtion been carried againſt them?

The Effects are ſimilar with regard to the Eloquence of the Church. Nothing is more common than for an eloquent Preacher to ſet his Hearers exulting at the Joys of Heaven, and ſhuddering at the Terrors of Hell; whom he never could poſſibly convince of the Exiſtence of either one or the other. The Conſequence is, that in the preſent Caſe, as ſoon as the Hearer goes out of Church, his Emotions, whether of Joy or Terror, ſubſide, and he frequently acts as before, juſt as if what he had been hearing deſcribed, exiſted only in the Imagination of the Preacher.

Now, I will venture to ſay, that could a clear and preciſe, (though cold and unimpaſſioned) Demonſtration of the Exiſtence of the Things deſcribed, be given, it would have a more laſting and powerful Effect, than all the glowing Colours of their Deſcription.

The Concluſion which is to be drawn from theſe Reflections, is evident. The public Speaker, who addreſſes the Paſſions

inſtead of the Underſtanding, either means to deceive, or is ignorant of the moſt effectual Method of recommending what he hath to offer to the Publick. A Mathematician never attempts to perſuade any body to believe in the Propoſitions of Euclid; why then ſhould Orators, if equally ſenſible of the Truth of what they advance, attempt to perſuade, when it would be ſo much more effectual to convince? All Subjects, it is true, are not equally capable of Demonſtration; but they are capable of Evidence; and every Man has a Right to require that Evidence on which another believes, when he would perſuade us to believe too. It is, indeed, the higheſt Affront to his Auditors, for an Orator to addreſs himſelf to their Paſſions, by any other Method than through their Underſtanding.

SECT. V. *Of Theatrical Declamation, or the Art of reciting dramatic Compoſitions.*

To treat of this Subject ſo fully as it requires, would itſelf take up a Volume; I ſhall here take notice, therefore, only of thoſe Particulars in which the Recital

of

of dramatic Compoſitions differs from that of others.

In the Recital of mere Narratives, of Deſcriptions, and of argumentative or perſuaſive Diſcourſes, the Reader ſtands in the Place, and ſpeaks in the Perſon of the Writer; but in the Rehearſal of Converſation-Pieces, he muſt diverſify not only his Mode of reciting, in Conformity to the Subject, but alſo in Conformity to the Character. Thus the ſame Narrative and Deſcription, if ſpoken by different Perſonages, muſt be differently recited. Will it be ſaid, "this is to require the "Reader to be an Actor, and to aſſume "the different Characters of the Scene?" Not at all. A Reader is not required to wear a Hump with King Richard, nor a great Belly with Sir John Falſtaff: Nay, he is not required even to ſaw the Air with his Hands, to make Faces, to laugh, to cry, nor indeed take any one Step in order to make the Hearer think him a Perſon of the Drama.

Any Attempt of this Kind would be ridiculous; for, ſpeaking alternately the Language of the whole *Dramatis Perſonæ*, he

cannot impoſe himſelf on the Imagination of the Auditor for either.

So far, however, as Language and Sentiment are concerned, the Reader may, and it is requiſite that he ſhould, obſerve the Diſtinction of Situation and Character. The ſame Sentiments are not only delivered differently by different Perſonages, but are delivered variouſly in various Circumſtances and Situations.

With what Difference are the ſame Apoſtrophes uttered by Shylock and Gratiano in the Merchant of Venice!

The former, with all the carping Eagerneſs of a cruel Mind intent on Revenge, cries out, when the Cauſe ſeemed to go in his Favour,

> A *Daniel* come to Judgment! Yea a *Daniel!*
> O *Wiſe* young Judge!—O *learned* Judge! &c.

When the Decree goes againſt him, Gratiano, with all the Exultation of a generous Mind relieved from the Load of his Friend's Diſtreſs, tinctured with a Mixture of deſerved Reproach, reminds him of his former Expreſſions.

> O *learned* Judge! Mark Jew! A *Daniel,* Jew!
> A *ſecond Daniel!* A *Daniel,* Jew!

Now

Now Infidel I have thee on the Hip.—
A DANIEL, *ſtill* ſay I, a *ſecond Daniel!*
I thank Thee Jew, for teaching me that Word.

It happens, indeed, not unfrequently, that the Poet himſelf neglects theſe Diſtinctions of Character and Circumſtance, in which Caſe, the Paſſage can hardly be recited with Propriety. Thus, if a ludicrous Sentiment, or Deſcription, ſhould come from a grave Perſonage in Circumſtances of great Diſtreſs; a tedious Tale be put into the Mouth of another in great Haſte; a ſolemn Argument into that of a Jeſter, &c. the Impropriety would be evident; as it would be impoſſible for the Reader to enforce the Sentiment, without violating the general Character, or the particular Situation of the Speaker. The minute Deſcription of the miſerable Apothecary, and his wretched Apparatus of empty Boxes, in Romeo and Juliet, I have always thought too inconſiſtent with the diſtracted and deſperate Situation of Romeo*. The ſame Objection may be

* Agreeable to this, his Appearance on the Stage generally raiſes a loud Laugh, doubtleſs an ill-timed one, in the Audience.—

made to the mincing Phraſes, which Shakeſpear (if they are really his) puts into the Mouth of Hotſpur, in deſcribing the Petit Maitre that came dreſs'd like a Popinjay to aſk for his Priſoners. I know this Deſcription hath been juſtified as Characteriſtic of Hotſpur; but its Minuteneſs and Length offend againſt the Time, Place and Circumſtance of the Scene.

No Narrative or Deſcription is, on the other hand, better introduced in this reſpect than Mercutio's Raillery about Queen Mab, in the firſt Act of Romeo and Juliet; Caſca's Relation of Cæſar's refuſing the Crown when offered him by the People; Falſtaff's Deſcription of his ragged Regiment; with many others, that might be ſelected from Shakeſpear †.

† This laſt mentioned Deſcription is ſo extremely beautiful in itſelf, ſo conſiſtent with the Character of the Speaker, the Time, Place, &c. that I cannot reſiſt the Temptation of citing it.

Fal. If I be not *aſham'd* of my *Soldiers*, I am a *ſowc'd Gurnet*: I have *miſ-us'd* the *King's Preſs* damnably. I have got, in *exchange* of an *hundred* and *fifty Soldiers*, *three hundred* and odd Pounds. I preſs me none but good *Houſholders*, *Yeomens Sons*; enquire me out *contracted Batchelors*, ſuch as had been *aſk'd twice* on the *Banns*: Such a Commodity of *warm* Slaves, as had as lieve hear the *Devil*,

As to the Recital of what may be ſtrictly called Dialogue, it ſo nearly reſembles common Converſation, that nothing more is neceſſary than to acquire a juſt Idea of the Character that ſpeaks, the true Senſe

vil, as a *Drum*; *ſuch* as *fear* the *Report* of a *Caliver*, worſe than a *ſtruck Fowl*, or a *hurt Wild-Duck*. I *preſs* me none but *ſuch Toaſts* and *Butter*, with *Hearts* in their Bellies *no bigger* than *Pins Heads*, and *they* have *bought* out their *Services*: And now my *whole Charge* conſiſts of *Ancients*, *Corporals*, *Lieutenants*, *Gentlemen* of *Companies*, Slaves as *ragged* as LAZARUS in the painted Cloth; and *ſuch* as indeed were never *Soldiers*, but diſcarded unjuſt *Serving-Men*, *younger Sons* to *younger Brothers*; *revolted Tapſters*, and *Oſtlers Trade-fall'n*, the *Cankers* of a *calm World* and *long Peace*; and *ſuch* have I to *fill* up the *Rooms* of *them* that have *bought out* their *Services*; that you would think, I had a *Hundred* and *Fifty tatter'd Prodigals*, lately come from *Swine-keeping*, from eating *Draff* and *Huſks*. A mad Fellow *met me* on the *Way*, and *told* me, I had *unloaded* all the *Gibbets*, and *preſt* the *dead Bodies*. *No* Eye hath ſeen ſuch *Scare-Crows*: I'll not *march* through *Coventry* with them, that's *flat*. *Nay*, and the Villains march *wide* betwixt the *Legs*, as if they had *Gyves* on; for, indeed, I had the *moſt* of them out of *Priſon*. There's but a *Shirt* and a *half* in *all* my *Company*; and the *half Shirt* is *two Napkins tack'd together*, and thrown over the Shoulders like a *Herald's Coat* without Sleeves; and the *Shirt*, to ſay the *Truth*, *ſtol'n* from my Hoſt of *St. Albans*; or the *red nos'd Inn-keeper* of *Daintry*. But *that's* all *one*, they'll find *Linen* enough on *every Hedge*.

of what he ſays, and a Knowledge of the Circumſtances of the Scene.

To one Thing, indeed, the Reader ought to be particularly attentive, in reciting dramatic Compoſition; and this is, never to addreſs himſelf to the Audience. The ſuppoſed Speakers converſe with each other, and not with a third Perſon; the Reader ſhould therefore repeat their Diſcourſe as if they were ſtill ſpeaking.

There is no Species of Writing more pleaſing than that which preſents us with a true Copy of Converſation. When the Perſons are noble, the Subject important, and the Spirit of Altercation well ſupported, it is the moſt intereſting and affecting of all others. The Scene between Brutus and Caſſius, as repreſented in Shakeſpear's Julius Cæſar, ſhould be the Model for all Writers of Dialogue; as the Recital of it is the Teſt of all accompliſhed Readers. I make no Apology, therefore, for inſerting it here, as well by way of Exerciſe to their Talents, as to give them a perfect Idea of what I mean by that true Spirit of Altercation which ſhould animate all dramatic Compoſition, and diſtinguiſh Dialogue from Declamation.

Brutus *and* Caſſius.

Caſ. That you have *wrong'd* me doth *appear* in *this*,
You have *condemn'd* and *noted Lucius Pella*,
For *taking Bribes* here of the *Sardians*;
Wherein, my *Letter* (*praying* on his *Side*,
Becauſe I *knew* the *Man*,) was *ſlighted of*.

Bru. You *wrong'd* YOURSELF, to *write* in *ſuch* a *Caſe*,

Caſ. In *ſuch* a *Time* as *this*, it is *not meet*
That every *nice Offence* ſhould bear its *Comment*.

Bru. Yet *let me tell* you, *Caſſius*, *you* YOURSELF
Are *much condemn'd* to have an *itching Palm*;
To *ſell*, and *mart* your *Offices* for *Gold*
To *Undeſervers*.

Caſ. I an *itching Palm?*
You *know* that *you* are BRUTUS, that *ſpeak this*;
Or, by the *Gods*, *this Speech* were *elſe* your *laſt*,

Bru. The Name of CASSIUS *honours* this *Corruption*,
And *Chaſtiſement* doth *therefore hide* its *Head*,

Caſ. Chaſtiſement!

Bru. Remember MARCH, the IDES of MARCH *remember!*
Did not great JULIUS *bleed* for *Juſtice* Sake?
What *Villain touch'd* his *Body*, that did *ſtab*,
And *not* for *Juſtice? What*, ſhall *one* of *us*,
That *ſtruck* the *foremoſt Man* of *all this World*,
But for *ſupporting Robbers*; ſhall *we* now
Contaminate our *Fingers* with *baſe Bribes?*
And *ſell* the *mighty Space of* our *large Honours*
For ſo much *Traſh*, as may be *graſped thus?*——
I had rather be a *Dog*, and *bay* the *Moon*,
Than *ſuch* a *Roman*.

Caſ. Brutus, BAY not ME,
I'll not *endure* it; you *forget* yourſelf,
To *hedge me in*; I am a *Soldier*, I,
Older in Practice, *abler* than *yourſelf*
To *make Conditions*.

Bru.

Bru. Go to; you *are not, Caſſius.*
Caſ. I AM.
Bru. I ſay you *are not.*
Caſ. Urge me *no more,* I ſhall *forget myſelf*——
Have mind upon your *Health*—*tempt* me no *farther.*
Bru. Away, ſlight Man.
Caſ. Is't *poſſible*——
Bru. Hear me, for *I will ſpeak.*
Muſt *I give Way* and Room to *your raſh Choler?*
Shall *I* be *frighted,* when a *mad Man ſtares?*
Caſ. O *Gods!* ye *Gods!* muſt I *endure* all *this?*
Bru. All this! ay MORE. *Fret,* till your proud Heart *break.*
Go *ſhew* your *Slaves* how *choleric* you are,
And make your BONDMEN *tremble.* Muſt *I budge?*
Muſt *I obſerve you?* muſt *I ſtand* and *crouch*
Under your *teſty* Humour? By the *Gods,*
You ſhall *digeſt* the *Venom* of your *Spleen,*
Tho' it do SPLIT you. For, *from this Day forth,*
I'll uſe you for my *Mirth,* yea, for my *Laughter,*
When you are *waſpiſh.*
Caſ. Is it come to *this?*
Bru. You ſay, you are a *better Soldier;*
Let it *appear ſo;* make your *Vaunting* TRUE,
And it ſhall *pleaſe* me *well.* For mine *own* Part,
I ſhall be *glad* to *learn* of *noble Men.*
Caſ. You *wrong* me *every* Way—you *wrong* me, *Brutus;*
I ſaid, an ELDER *Soldier; not* a BETTER.
Did I ſay, *better?*
Bru. If you *did,* I *care not.*
Caſ. When CÆSAR *liv'd,* he *durſt* not *thus* have *mov'd* me.
Bru. Peace, Peace, you *durſt not* ſo have *tempted* him.
Caſ. I DURST not!—
Bru. No.
Caſ. What? durſt not *tempt* him?
Bru. For your *Life* you *durſt* not.

Caſ.

Caſ. Do not *preſume too much* upon my *Love:*
I *may do that* I ſhall be *ſorry* for.
Bru. You *have done that* you ſhould be *ſorry* for.
There is *no Terror, Caſſius,* in your *Threats;*
For I am *arm'd* ſo *ſtrong* in *Honeſty,*
That they *paſs* by me, as the *idle Wind,*
Which I reſpect not. I did *ſend* to you
For *certain Sums* of *Gold,* which you *deny'd* me;
For *I* can *raiſe no Money* by *vile Means;*
By *Heaven,* I had rather *coin* my *Heart,*
And *drop* my *Blood* for *Drachmas,* than to *wring*
From the *hard* Hands of *Peaſants* their *vile Traſh,*
By any *Indirection.* I did *ſend*
To you for *Gold* to *pay* my *Legions,*
Which you *denied* me; was *that* done like CASSIUS?
Should I have *anſwer'd* CAIUS CASSIUS *ſo?*
When *Marcus Brutus* grows ſo *covetous,*
To *lock* ſuch *raſcal Counters* from his *Friends,*
Be *ready, Gods,* with *all* your *Thunderbolts,*
Daſh him to *Pieces!*
Caſ. I *deny'd* you *not.*
Bru. You *did.*
Caſ. I *did not*——*he* was but a *Fool,*
That *brought* my *Anſwer back.*—*Brutus* hath *riv'd* my *Heart,*
A *Friend* ſhould bear a *Friend's Infirmities,*
But *Brutus* makes *mine greater* than *they are.*
Bru. I *do not,* till you *practiſe* them on *me.*
Caſ. You *love* me *not.*
Bru. I do not *like* your *Faults.*
Caſ. A *friendly Eye* could never ſee *ſuch Faults.*
Bru. A *Flatt'rer's would* not, tho' they do *appear*
As *huge* as *high* Olympus.
Caſ. Come, ANTONY, and young OCTAVIUS, *come:*
Revenge yourſelves *alone* on *Caſſius,*
For *Caſſius* is *a-weary* of the *World;*
Hated by *one* he *loves; brav'd* by his *Brother;*

Check'd

Check'd like a *Bondman*; *all* his *Faults obſerv'd*
Set in a *Note Book*, *learn'd* and *conn'd* by *Rote*,
To *caſt* into my *Teeth*. O I could *weep*
My *Spirit* from mine *Eyes!*——*There* is my *Dagger*,
And *here* my *naked Breaſt*——*within*, a *Heart*,
Dearer than *Plutus'* Mine, *richer* than *Gold*:
If that thou beeſt a *Roman*, *take* it forth.
I, that *deny'd* thee *Gold*, will *give* my *Heart*;
Strike, as thou *didſt* at *Cæſar*; for I know,
When thou didſt *hate* him *worſt*, thou *lov'dſt* him *better*
Than *ever* thou *lov'dſt Caſſius*.
Bru. Sheath your *Dagger*;
Be *angry* when you *will*, *it* ſhall have *Scope*;
Do what you *will*, *Diſhonour* ſhall be *Humour*.
O *Caſſius*, you are *yoked* with a *Lamb*,
That carries *Anger*, as the *Flint* bears *Fire*;
Who, *much enforced*, ſhews a *haſty Spark*,
And ſtraight is *cold* again.

There is ſtill a Part of dramatic Compoſition unmentioned; in the Recital of which the Reader may find ſome Difficulty; as it is that, in which our Poets and Players betray moſt Defects. This is the *Soliloquy*. By the diſagreeable and defective Manner, in which Soliloquies are uſually written and ſpoken, it ſeems as if there were a peculiar Difficulty in recording, or reciting a Man's Converſation with himſelf. But can it be greater than that of copying our Converſation with each other?

Some

Some Critics have objected to the Introduction of Soliloquies in the Drama; but they have not ſupported their Objections by ſufficient Arguments. The noble Author of the Elements of Criticiſm, after juſtifying their Uſe in general, obſerves in particular, that Shakeſpear's Soliloquies may be juſtly eſtabliſhed as a Model; it not being eaſy to conceive any Model more perfect. He contents himſelf with citing as a Proof, the two following, of very different Kinds. The firſt is the firſt Soliloquy of Hamlet.

Ham. O that *this* too, *too ſolid Fleſh* would *melt*,
Thaw, and *reſolve* itſelf into a *Dew!*
Or that the *Everlaſting* had not *fix'd*
His *Cannon* 'gainſt *Self-Murder:*
How *weary*, *ſtale*, and *unprofitable*
Seem to *me* all the *Uſes* of *this World!*
Fie on't! O *fie!* 'tis an *unweeded Garden*
That *grows* to *Seed*; Things *rank* and *groſs* in Nature
Poſſeſs it *meerly*. That it ſhould *come* to *this!*
But *two Months* dead? *Nay*, not ſo *much! not two*——
So *excellent* a King, that was to *this*,
Hyperion to a *Satyr:* So *loving* to my *Mother*,
That he *permitted not* the *Winds* of *Heaven*
Viſit her *Face* too *roughly! Heaven and Earth!*
Muſt I *remember?*—Why, ſhe would *hang on him*,
As if *Increaſe* of *Appetite* had grown
By what it *fed* on; yet within a *Month!*——
Let me not *think*—*Frailty*, thy Name is *Woman!*

A *little Month!*——or e'er thoſe *Shoes* were *old*,
With *which* ſhe *follow'd* my *poor Father*'s Body,
Like *Niobe*, *all Tears*——Why *ſhe*, even *ſhe*——
O *Heav'n!* A *Beaſt* that wants Diſcourſe of *Reaſon*
Would have *mourn'd longer!*—*married* with mine *Uncle*,
My *Father's Brother*; but *no more like* my *Father*,
Than *I* to *Hercules*.
It *is not*, nor it *cannot* come to *Good*.
But *break*, my *Heart*, for I muſt *hold my Tongue*.

The ſecond is the Soliloquy of Mr. Ford, in the third Act of the Merry Wives of Windſor.

Ford. Hum! *ha!* Is *this* a VISION? Is *this* a DREAM? Do I SLEEP? Maſter *Ford*, AWAKE, *awake*, Maſter *Ford*; there's a *Hole made* in your *beſt Coat*, Maſter *Ford*; *this* 'tis to be *married! this* 'tis to have *Linen* and *Buck-Baſkets!* Well, I will *proclaim myſelf* what I *am*; I will *now take* the *Leacher*; he is at my *Houſe*; he *cannot 'ſcape* me; 'tis *impoſſible* he *ſhould*; he *cannot creep* into a *Half-penny Purſe*, nor into a *Pepper Box*. But leſt the *Devil* that *guides* him ſhould *aid* him, I will *ſearch impoſſible* Places; tho' *what I am*, *I* cannot *avoid*, yet to *be* what I *would not*, *ſhall* not make me *tame*; if I have *Horns* to make one *mad*, let the *Proverb* go *with me*, I'll be *horn mad*.

Both theſe Soliloquies, Lord Kaims obſerves "are accurate Copies of Nature: "In a paſſionate Soliloquy one begins "with thinking aloud: And the ſtrongeſt "Feelings only are expreſſed: As the

"Speaker

" Speaker warms, he begins to imagine " one liſtening, and gradually ſlides into " a connected Diſcourſe."

It is a trite Maxim among the Critics, adopted by Mr. Pope and others, that all Soliloquies ſhould be ſhort and paſſionate. But the Impropriety, if there be any, lies in thinking aloud, or talking to one's ſelf in any Caſe. Is it leſs excuſable for People to laugh by themſelves, than to cry by themſelves? Or is it not as natural for us to talk to ourſelves when we are pleaſed, as when we are vexed? Doubtleſs it is; the Queſtion then comes to this, "what " Degree of Pleaſure, Mirth or Intereſt " is neceſſary to open our Mouths, or is " equivalent to ſo much Grief or Reſent- " ment? What Reaſon can be given, " why Falſtaff might not divert himſelf, " by laughing aloud in his Deſcription of " his ragged Regiment above-quoted, as " well as Hamlet recapitulate the Cir- " cumſtances of his Mother's Marriage " with his Uncle, or Mr. Ford perplex " himſelf aloud with the Apprehenſions " of his being made a Cuckold?" The Author of the Elements of Criticiſm, indeed, admits of Soliloquies upon lively and

and intereſting Subjects, though without any Turbulence of Paſſion. And that theſe may either be carried on in a continued Chain of Thoughts, or even in the Way of Dialogue with one's ſelf, if the Subject prompt a Man to think in the Mode of Altercation. As a Proof of this, he cites Falſtaff's celebrated Soliloquy on Honour: To which he might have added the following equally to the Purpoſe.

Fal. IMBOWELL'D!—if thou *imbowel* me to DAY, I'll give you Leave to POWDER me, and EAT me *To-morrow!* 'twas *Time* to *counterfeit*, or that *hot Termagant Scot* had paid me SCOT and LOT *too*. COUNTERFEIT? I am *no Counterfeit*; to DIE, is to be a *Counterfeit*; for *he* is but the *Counterfeit* of a *Man*, who *hath not the Life* of a *Man*: But to *counterfeit dying*, when a Man thereby *liveth*, is to be *no Counterfeit*, but the *true* and *perfect Image* of *Life*, *indeed*. The *better* Part of *Valour* is *Diſcretion*; in the *which better Part*, I have *ſaved* my *Life*. I am *afraid* of this *Gunpowder Percy*, though he be *dead*. How if *he* ſhou'd *counterfeit too*, and *riſe?* I am *afraid* he would *prove the better Counterfeit*; therefore I'll *make* him *ſure*; *yea*, and I'll *ſwear*, I *kill'd* him. Why may not *he* riſe as well as *I?* Nothing *confutes* me but *Eyes*, and *no Body ſees* me. *Therefore*, Sirrah, with a *new Wound* in your *Thigh come you* along with *me*.

This is as natural a Soliloquy I believe, as ever was written; but cannot with any Propriety be termed paſſionate. Let this Matter

Matter ſtand as it will, however, with regard to the Writer, the Reader ſhould conſider that it is juſt as natural for Men to reaſon as to rave; he ſhould not take it for granted, therefore, that every Soliloquy he meets with, is to be read with Pathos. He ſhould in this Caſe, as in all others, endeavour to acquire a juſt Idea of the Frame of Mind and Diſpoſition of the Speaker, and recite his Words exactly as if he were alone, and talking to himſelf. To conclude, when the Reader can acquit himſelf properly of this Species of Recital, he may venture to congratulate himſelf, on his having overcome the greateſt Difficulties in this Art.

APPENDIX.

The Sketch of a Plan for eſtabliſhing a Criterion, by which the Pronunciation of Languages may be aſcertained; and, in particular that of the Engliſh Tongue, reduced to a Certain fixt Standard.

HAVING been induced, ſince the Commencement of the foregoing Sheets, to apply my Thoughts concerning Orthoëpy or Pronunciation in general, to the eſtabliſhing a Criterion for that of the Engliſh Language in particular; it is judged expedient to give the Purchaſers of this Introduction a ſhort Sketch of that Deſign: eſpecially, as I have undertaken to carry it into Execution, by the Publication of a *Rhetorical Grammar*; of which the Reader is already informed;

and alſo of a *Rhetorical Dictionary* * conſiſtent with the ſame Plan.

The Reader is already made acquainted with the Inconveniencies ariſing to Foreigners and Provincials, from the abſurd Manner in which our Engliſh Grammarians divide their Words into Syllables; as alſo of the Perplexity occaſioned even to poliſhed Speakers and Readers, by the Cuſtom of teaching the Proſody of modern Language on the Principles of the Ancients.

There is ſtill one fundamantal Error, greater than either of theſe; which is common to modern Grammarians of all Countries †: This is the Method of teaching the Orthoëpy of a Language, by applying the particular Sounds and Modes of Articulation uſed in Speech, to written Types common to various Languages, inſtead of thoſe general written Types, to thoſe Sounds and Modes of Articulation which are peculiar to each Tongue.

* The *Grammar* in one Vol. *Octavo*. To be publiſhed as ſoon as poſſible. The *Dictionary* in one Vol. *Quarto*. To be publiſhed at lateſt before the end of next Winter.

† Not even Dr. Wallis himſelf, who inveſtigated this Subject farther than moſt Writers, was aware of this Error.

Hence

Hence it is, as has been before obſerved, that different Nations, applying different Sounds and Modes of Articulation to the ſame Types, find ſo much Difficulty in acquiring the Pronunciation of the Words of each other's Language. Whereas, if the contrary Method were purſued, and the elementary Sounds and Modes of Articulation peculiar to each Language were firſt acquired, and the Types, or Combination of Types denoting them, diſtinctly pointed out, we ſhould need only to make ourſelves Maſters of thoſe Sounds and Modes, and by turning to a Vocabulary properly compiled, we ſhould know how to apply them with the greateſt Exactneſs.

It will be imagined probably by thoſe who have not examined far into this Subject, that theſe Sounds and Modes of Articulation are very numerous and various. On the contrary, however, they are but few, and in moſt European Languages very much alike. It is true, the German, the Low-Dutch, and other Northern Nations, have ſome guttural Sounds and Modes which the Engliſh have not. The French have likewiſe ſome palatial, or ra-

ther naſal Modes, particularly in the Provinces, which we never uſe; on the other hand, we have ſome few aſpirated Modes, to which they, as well as moſt other Nations, are Strangers; of this Kind are the two Modes of Utterance denoted by *Th*. If we except a ſmall Number of theſe, and ſomething of a general Mode or Tone that affects the whole Diſcourſe, the reſt of the elementary Sounds of moſt European Languages are the ſame.

With regard to the Number of theſe primary Elements of Speech, even thoſe Grammarians, who have perceived their Exiſtence, have not treated them with that Accuracy the Caſe requires. Thus when Buffier takes upon him to ſay, that there are Twenty-four ſimple Sounds in the Engliſh Language, Twenty in the Spaniſh, Twenty-nine in the Italian, Thirty in the German, and Thirty-three in the French; he makes no Diſtinction between diſtinct Sounds and mere Modes of Articulation; many of which are totally mute. Add to this, that few Perſons are capable of judging of the Elements of any but their native Language. It is no Wonder, therefore, if this Author

thor miſtook in the Number of ſimple Sounds of the Engliſh; who, are ſo far from having Twenty-four diſtinct Sounds, that they have no more than Sixteen. And if we take the ſimple Modes of Articulation into the Account, they amount both together to above Forty.

It is pretended by ſome, that the elementary Sounds and Modes of Articulation in the Greek and Latin Languages, exactly anſwered in Point of Number to that of their Characters or written Types. For my own Part, I can hardly believe this to be true. It is notorious, that the Greeks had various Dialects, as the Attic, the Doric, &c. we find alſo that ſeveral of the Latin Authors were accuſed of a Patavinity or Provinciality of Expreſſion. Are we to ſuppoſe that theſe Dialects affected only their written Language, and not their Pronunciation or Manner of Speech? Perhaps this Point is not well to be aſcertained; conſidering the Uncertainty the Moderns lie under reſpecting the Pronunciation of the dead Languages. Be this, however, as it may, certain it is, that in Engliſh, neither the Number of the vocal and written Elements are the

ſame; nor do the ſame Types conſtantly expreſs the ſame Sound or Mode of Articulation. Theſe Circumſtances occaſion that Perplexity and Confuſion in the Orthoëpy of our Language which I propoſe to uſe my Endeavours to remove.

To this end, I enquire, firſt, into the Number and Nature of the ſimple Elements above-mentioned; which may be generally diſtinguiſhed into *Sounds*, and *Modes* of Articulation: The former, uſually denoted in Writing by Vowels, and the latter, by Conſonants. It is to be obſerved, with regard to this Diſtinction, however, that, as the Sounds denoted by the Vowels are not equally diſtinct, but deſcend gradually from the moſt clear and acute, to the moſt dull and obtuſe, even to the indiſtinct and half-articulate; ſo the Modes of Articulation, indicated by the Conſonants, are in the ſame Manner far from being all equally mute, but ariſe gradually from the moſt ſilent to the moſt vocal.

The Number of theſe Sounds, as well as Modes, though greater indeed than that of our written Types, is yet ſtill much leſs than will at firſt be imagined; if

if we reflect on the vaſt Number of Syllables that may be formed by the various Combinations of the Letters of our Alphabet. For with regard to the vocal Modes of Sound, or that Mode indicated by the Vowels, I have not been able as yet to find one Syllable in all the Words of our Language, as they are pronounced by the moſt poliſhed Speakers, the Mode of which is not included in ſome or other of the following Words. *Ball, bar, bard, hail, heel, hell, hit, mile, hot, go, who, cube, cur, toy, good, thou.* If to theſe Sixteen diſferent diſtinct Sounds, we add that indiſtinct Mode in which we generally pronounce the Particles *a* and *the* before a Subſtantive, as alſo the laſt Syllables in ſuch Words as *priſon, vocal, humble,* &c. I believe * we ſhall have all the elementary Sounds in our Language.

* I ſay *believe*, becauſe it is poſſible, in ſo nice an Inveſtigation, dependent altogether on the Ear, ſome *one* may have eſcaped me. I know that Provincials and affected Speakers have ſeveral; but as I chuſe to found my Criterion of Pronunciation on the univerſal or general Practice of the moſt poliſhed Speakers, viz. Men of Letters and Education at Court, it is to the Cuſtom of theſe only that I have attended in adjuſting this Particular.

Theſe

Theſe Sounds, are yet ſo far from being conſtantly denoted in Writing by the ſame Types or Combination of Types, that thoſe Types are not only ſubſtituted frequently for one another; but a ſingle Type is often made uſe of inſtead of a Combination of Types, and *vice verſa*.

Thus the Sound of *ball*, is frequently typified in *maul*, *drawl*, *thought*, *broad*, *abſolve*, &c.

That of *Bar*, in *are*.
of *Bard*, in *laugh*.
of *Hail*, in *reign*, *ale*, *day*, *they*, *there*, *bear*.
of *Heel*, in *veal*, *piece*, *machine*, *replete*, *conceive*, *James*, &c.
of *Hell*, in *Health*.
of *Hit*, in *yet*, *women*, *buſy*, *build*, &c.
of *Mile*, in *why*, *buy*, *boil*.
of *Hot*, in *what*.
of *Go*, in *foe*, *note*, *goat*, *though*, *know*.
of *Who*, in *ſoup*, *noon*, *prove*.
of *Cube*, in *feud*, *few*, *you*, *clue*, *ſhoe*.
of *Cur*, in *ſtir*, *her*, *love*, *won*, *earth*, *blood*, *tough*, *were*, *acre*.
of *Toy*, in *toil*.
of *Good*, in *bull*, *could*.
of *Thou*, in *Town*.

In this Specimen alone we ſee that the Sound of *u* in *Cur*, is in different Words denoted by no leſs than three different Vowels,

Vowels, and five various Combinations, viz. by *e*, *i*, *o*, *ee*, *ea*, *ou*, *oe*, *oo*; on the other hand, we ſee the Letter *a* denote five different Sounds, in *ball*, *bar*, *bard*, *day*, *what*; while the Combination *ou* hath no leſs than ſix different Sounds in *though*, *ſoup*, *you*, *tough*, *could*, *thou*.

In like manner, the Modes of Articulation, uſually typified by Conſonants, are ſometimes expreſſed by one or more others, whoſe common Mode is quite different. Thus GH and PH in *Writing*, frequently denote the Power of F in *Speech*: as in *Phariſee*, *Ralph*, *laugh*, &c. Again, ſome Conſonants denote two Modes almoſt equally *general*; thus C hath both the Power of S and of K, as in *ceaſe*, *Candle*. G hath ſometimes the Power of I or Ch, and at others nearly that of *k* as in *gentle*, *grant*, &c.

On the other hand, we have many Types that only ſerve to indicate a greater Aſpiration, or an Addition of Force to a a Mode expreſſed by another; thus in the *Labials* B and P, the latter is only ſtronger or more forcible; differing very little from the former in Point of Mode: The like may be ſaid of the *Dentals* D and T;

of

of the *Palatials* G and K; the *Labidentals* V and F; and alſo of the *Linguidentals* C, S, and Z.

This uncertain Uſe of the Application of Sounds and Modes of Articulation to written Types, induced a particular Enquiry into the gradual Relations of the ſeveral Elements of Speech, as they proceed in the Scale before-mentioned, from the moſt ſilent to the moſt vocal. The Conſequence of this Enquiry, was the following Table or Alphabet conſtructed; in which I have diſtinguiſhed them, as well as I could, by the Sounds moſt uſually annexed to the Letters. But as it is impoſſible to convey the reſpective Elements to the Reader accurately by Letters, I have annexed the Syllables or Words in which they are uſed. And leſt this ſhould be ineffectual, as in ſome Caſes it may, I have ſeverally numbered them, ſo that good Speakers may aſcertain, and communicate them very eaſily and certainly to others.

N° 1	b as in	bat
2	p - - -	pat
3	d - - -	dad
4	t - - -	tap
5	g - - -	gag
6	k - - -	kick, Chorus
7	h - - -	Hand
8	dh - - -	then, cloathe
9	th - - -	thin, Mouth
10	v - - -	Veal
11	f - - -	feel
12	y - - -	yield
13	J - - -	James, gentle
14	ch - - -	Chair, Queſtion
15	ſh - - -	Shame, Paſſion, ſocial, Nation, Machine
16	zh - - -	Meaſure, oſier, Confuſion
17	z - - -	Zeal, roſe
18	c or s - -	ceaſe, hiſs, yes
19	l - - - -	Lamb
20	m - - -	Man
21	n - - -	Nun
22	r - - - -	run
23	Q - - -	queer
24	w - - -	wall.

Such are the ſimple Modes of Articulation in our Language, indicated, as the Reader will ſee, chiefly by Conſonants. The two laſt, however, are almoſt vocal; Q never being written without the Vowel U after it, and W being little more than an obtuſe or indiſtinct Mode of repeating the U. With reſpect to N° 1, 2,

or

or *b* and *p*, they are totally ſilent; differing from each other only in the greater or leſs Degree, in which we preſs our Lips together; before we pronounce the Syllable they ſerve to articulate.

They are of themſelves ſo entirely mute, however, that they admit not of the leaſt Breath to iſſue from the Mouth, nor are accompanied with the leaſt Sound, naſal or guttural.

At N° 3, 4, or *d* and *t* which differ from each other alſo nearly in the ſame Manner as *b* and *p*, the Mouth barely opens; but the Tongue cleaves to the roof of the Mouth juſt within the upper Teeth, ſo that they are equally ſilent.

At N° 5, 6, or *g* and *k* the Mouth opens a little wider, but the Tongue lies equally motionleſs in the Bottom of the Mouth: So that all theſe ſix Modes are from the very Appulſe of the Organs neceſſarily ſilent.

At N° 7, or *h*, we begin to breathe; or emit the ſimpleſt of all the audible Elements of Speech.

N° 8 and 9, or *dh* and *th* are forcible Expreſſions of the Breath with the Tongue between the Teeth, from which they re-

ceive

ceive a kind of Articulation, and might with as great Propriety be called articulate Expirations.

N° 10 and 11, or *v* and *f*, are of the ſame Kind, only differently modified between the Teeth and Lips, as the preceding were by the Teeth and Tongue.

In N° 12, or *y*, the Breath is modelled farther within the Mouth, and begins to to partake of the *Hiſs*.*

N° 13 and 14, or *i* and *ch* are more forcible Expreſſions of the ſame Kind, in which the Aſpirate is evidently converted in a great meaſure into an Hiſs.

N° 14, 15, 16, are different Compounds of the Aſpirate and Hiſs.

N° 17 and 18, or *z*, and *o* or *s* are diſtinct Hiſſings, occaſioned by the forcible Expulſion of the Breath through the Teeth.

N° 19, 20, 21, 22, or *l*, *m*, *n*, *r*, are full Modes of Articulation, accompanied either by a palatial, or a guttural Sound previous to the Articulation of the ſubſe-

* An *Aſpirate* differs from an *Hiſs*, in that the former is emitted with the Teeth open, and the latter with the Teeth ſhut.

quent

quent Vowel. Hence they are ſometimes called ſemi-vocal.

N° 23, 24, are alſo ſemi-vocal, and approach very nearly to that indiſtinct or half articulate Sound, which has been already mentioned, and ſeems to be a Kind of mean Element between a Conſonant and a Vowel.

As to the diſtinct Sounds or Elements denoted by the Vowels, exemplified above; they proceed gradually from the moſt dull and obtuſe, to the moſt clear and acute, in the following Order.

N° 1	u	as in	cull, cub
2	ow		town, noun
3	ou		could, bull, good
4	oo		noon, group, ſoup, who
5	aw		draw, ball
6	ew		few, cube, ſhoe
7	o		not, what, ſwan
8	oe		foe, toe, note
9	oi		toil, joy
10	aa		bard, command
11	a		and, hat
12	ae		mate, hail
13	e		met
14	ee		meet, ſeat
15	i		fit, yes
16	ii or y		why, nigh

Having

Having thus inveſtigated all the ſimple Sounds and Modes of Articulation peculiar to the Engliſh Tongue, it is purpoſed to aſcertain next what Modes of Articulation will admit of their preceding or ſucceeding each other; and to lay down ſuch Rules, in the projected Grammar, that the Pronunciation of our Language may no longer remain in a State of Confuſion and Uncertainty.

Again, to prevent a Multiplicity of Rules from deterring or diſguſting the Learner, the Dictionary is ſo contrived as to ſhew, at Sight, the exact Pronunciation of every Word, to all ſuch Perſons as are capable of uttering the ſeveral ſimple Sounds, and of managing their Organs of Speech, agreeable to the Modes of Articulation abovementioned.

It muſt be confeſſed, that ſo arduous and laborious an Undertaking, as that of eſtabliſhing a general Criterion for the Pronunciation of the Engliſh Language, would better ſuit the united Abilities of a Society of Academicians, than thoſe of a private Individual. But Geniuſes are, for the moſt Part, too excentric and unruly to become Beaſts of Burthen. It is ſel-

dom any Number of them can be induced to draw one Way. I am on this Occaſion, however, proud to own, that I am not deſtitute of Aſſiſtance, ſhould I ſtand in Need of it, in the preſent Attempt; and I appeal to Experience for the Truth of the Obſervation, that the candid Opinion of one ingenious and learned Friend, is often of more real Importance than the Suffrage of a whole Academy of inattentive or ſuperficial Obſervers.

FINIS.